

L. Bower (a.)

2/6 Pd.
5

A COMPLETE AND FINAL

DETECTION

OF

699. c 1
2

A—d B—r.

MUSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

CONTAINING

A summary VIEW of the *Evidence* formerly produced
against him;

A CONFUTATION of the *Evasions* and *Subterfuges* in
his several *Defences*; and

Many new DEMONSTRATIONS of the Fictions of the
Pretended Convert, on the Authority of *Original
Papers, Certificates, and Attestations*, now first
published;

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A POSTSCRIPT, in Answer to *some very remarkable
Facts, &c.* and an APPENDIX, containing the *Original
Papers*.

Alas you, what Provocation I have had!
The strong Antipathy of good to bad, POPE.

By the AUTHOR of the *Full Confutation, &c.*

L O N D O N,

Printed for J. MORGAN, in *Pater-noster-Row*, 1758.

[Price Two Shillings.]

Published Thurd. Feb. 23. 1758

A COMPLETE AND FINAL

DECLARATION



1-1-13

1-1-13

I, the undersigned, do hereby declare that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original as the same appears in the records of the Court of the County of [illegible] State of [illegible]

Witness my hand and seal this [illegible] day of [illegible] 19[illegible]

[illegible]

I, the undersigned, do hereby declare that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original as the same appears in the records of the Court of the County of [illegible] State of [illegible]

Witness my hand and seal this [illegible] day of [illegible] 19[illegible]

[illegible]

1-1-13

I, the undersigned, do hereby declare that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original as the same appears in the records of the Court of the County of [illegible] State of [illegible]

Witness my hand and seal this [illegible] day of [illegible] 19[illegible]

[illegible]

I, the undersigned, do hereby declare that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original as the same appears in the records of the Court of the County of [illegible] State of [illegible]

Witness my hand and seal this [illegible] day of [illegible] 19[illegible]

[illegible]

I, the undersigned, do hereby declare that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original as the same appears in the records of the Court of the County of [illegible] State of [illegible]

Witness my hand and seal this [illegible] day of [illegible] 19[illegible]

[illegible]

I, the undersigned, do hereby declare that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original as the same appears in the records of the Court of the County of [illegible] State of [illegible]

Witness my hand and seal this [illegible] day of [illegible] 19[illegible]

[illegible]

I, the undersigned, do hereby declare that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original as the same appears in the records of the Court of the County of [illegible] State of [illegible]

Witness my hand and seal this [illegible] day of [illegible] 19[illegible]

[illegible]

T O

The Most Rev^d the *Archbishops*,

The Right Rev^d the *Bishops*,

The Learned *Universities*,

A N D

The Rev^d the *Clergy* of this Kingdom,

This

D E T E C T I O N,

originally undertaken, and now completed, with a View to serve the Cause of Protestants, and to prevent future Impositions of this dangerous Nature, is most humbly inscribed, as to proper JUDGES of the *Evidence* and *Importance* of the *Discovery*,

By their most obedient humble

Servant

The A U T H O R.

The Most Rev. the Archbishop,
The Right Rev. the Bishop,
The Learned Universities,

AND

The Rev. the Clergy of this King-
dom,

This

DEVOTION

originally undertaken, and now completed, with
a View to bring the Cause of Protestantism, and
to prevent future impositions of this dangerous
Nature, is most humbly intended, as to present
Juries of the Religion and Government of the
Kingdom.

By their most obedient servant

Robert

THE AUTHOR.

T A B L E

O F C O N T E N T S.

<p>Chap. I. <i>Reasons for reviving this Subject,</i></p> <p>Chap. II. <i>Comparison of B——r and Fournier,</i></p> <p>Chap. III. <i>The Evidence produced to prove the Genuineness of the Letters, summed up,</i></p> <p>Chap. IV. <i>Proofs of B——r's Money Transaction with the Jesuits, and Reflexions on it,</i></p> <p>Chap. V. <i>Other Transactions of B——r with Papists and Jesuits,</i></p> <p>Chap. VI. <i>No Reason to suspect that the Jesuits have forged the Letters,</i></p> <p>Chap. VII. <i>Mr. B——r's general Character, unfavorable to the Supposition of his Innocence, in the Case before us,</i></p> <p>Chap. VIII. <i>Mr. B——r's Character further illustrated by Facts,</i></p> <p>Chap. IX. <i>The Detection of B——r's Inquisition Tale and Italian Adventures, proposed as the Design of the following Sheets,</i></p> <p>Chap. X. <i>Confirmation of Father Conyer's Evidence,</i></p> <p>Chap. XI. <i>Detection of B——r, on the Evidence of Mr. Christopher Maire,</i></p> <p>Chap. XII. <i>The Attestation of Calabrinì vindicated and confirmed,</i></p> <p>Chap. XIII. <i>Detection of B——r on the Evidence of Prospero Affenziaii, a Canon of Macerata,</i></p> <p>Chap. XIV. <i>B——r detected by a Certificate from the Inquisitor General of Ancona,</i></p>	<p>P. 3</p> <p>5</p> <p>8</p> <p>14</p> <p>18</p> <p>22</p> <p>30</p> <p>38</p> <p>44</p> <p>47</p> <p>49</p> <p>53</p> <p>57</p> <p>60</p> <p>Chap.</p>
--	--

TABLE of Contents.

Chap. XV.	
Montecuculi no Inquisitor, and B——r's <i>Imposture detected by another Certificate from Ancona,</i>	66
Chap. XVI.	
<i>Reflexions on the foregoing Detection,</i>	73
Chap. XVII.	
<i>Detection of B——r, on the Evidence of Mr. Cæsar Parisetti,</i>	77
Chap. XVIII.	
<i>Fictions concerning Vincenzo della Torre, detected by the Affidavit of Sig. Constantini of Fermo,</i>	80
Chap. XIX.	
<i>Vincenzo della Torre's Existence disproved by the Evidence of Sig. Costa and Cotononi of Macerata,</i>	83
Chap. XX.	
<i>B——r never Professor of Rhetoric at Rome, proved from a Certificate of the Provincial of the Roman Province,</i>	86
Chap. XXI.	
<i>Detection of B——r from the Registers of the Roman College,</i>	89
Chap. XXII.	
<i>Carteret's Correspondence with B——r authenticated,</i>	105
Chap. XXIII.	
<i>Detection of B——r, about the Time of his first leaving Scotland,</i>	108
Chap. XXIV.	
<i>The Evidence summed up and Reflexions upon it,</i>	111
Chap. XXV.	
<i>Proofs that Papists put on the Disguise of Protestants,</i>	118
Chap. XXVI.	
<i>Conclusion of the Controversy,</i>	129
POSTSCRIPT,	133
APPENDIX,	

Amongst other Errata, correct the following :

Page 40. l. 10. for *no passages* read *no such passages*.

Page 83, Contents of Chapter, for *Torre's Evidence* read *Torre's Existence*; and for *cerata* r. *Macerata*.

*Reasons for reviving this Subject*

I WOULD not have it supposed, that I thought it necessary to revive this subject, merely because my antagonist, hardened in iniquity, persists in his insolent attempts to evade a charge, whose proofs are as strong, as the facts are heinous. His last *reply* deserved no answer, because to positive evidence, and solid argument, it opposes only a fresh cargo of that vile abuse, unsupported assertion, and *Jesuitical* Sophistry, which had been so liberally dispensed in his former performances, and were so effectually exposed in my *Full Confutation*. And though I am not ignorant that there are readers of that pliability of understanding as to have no other rule of determining which side of an argument to favour, but to know which of the advocates had the *last word*, yet, perfectly satisfied that every reader capable of forming an opinion, has already chose his side: I could never think it necessary to descend to another combat with the outrageous *Jesuit*, whom I had driven out of every entrenchment, merely to preserve my superiority in the uninformed judgment of a few fluctuating spectators. These I despise equally with another set of worthy and candid friends of the *Jesuit*, who, in this controversy, have so honorably displayed their impartiality, as to refuse even to read the evidence that has been produced against him.

However, tho' I never proposed to revive a dispute, already so long agitated, merely to shew, what every sensible reader could see without my help, the miserable insufficiency of this *unhappy man's* last vindication of himself, I always thought it would

be my duty, and what the public had a right to expect from me, to take some method of conveying to their hands, any new instances of his daring *fictions* which might come to light. Such instances, more in number, and in consequence, than could have been well imagined, are *actually* come to light. These having been lately communicated to me by the same worthy gentleman to whom we owed the Letters to Father *Sheldon*, I should ill deserve that approbation with which the public has rewarded my *abhorrence of iniquity*, and my *endeavours to detect it*, if I did not take the earliest opportunity of bringing *B—r* once more before the bar of public justice, to receive a *fourth* and a *final* condemnation.

I should be extremely sorry, if any one could think me so weak, as to hope that any thing I can now publish should produce an *alteration of opinion*, in the few persons of merit, who, for reasons best known to themselves, but unaccountable to others, still persist in protecting *one* proved to be so unworthy of their protection. They who have resisted the force of the evidence produced already, will, no doubt, be uniform, in resisting the *evidence* which I shall *now* produce. What I principally aim at, is to complete the *picture* which, till now, I could only delineate; that, besides gratifying the curiosity of those who may be desirous of tracing *B—r* through all his disguises, the end of my *detection* of him may be more fully obtained. The public, by seeing how far this *strange man* has ventured to carry his attempts to deceive, will be more upon their guard against future impositions: and by following him through the amazing extent of his *unparalleled hypocrisy*, as I propose, in the present sheets, we shall have an instructive tho' a melancholy lesson, how far the *possibilities of guilt*, may be exemplified, in a *living character*.

C H A P. II.

Comparison of B——r and Fournier.

THE awful protestations that this man hath made to screen himself from detection, the unblushing firmness of countenance which he possesses, and the insolent perseverance with which he persists in his iniquity; these are appearances so astonishing, that some may doubt whether it be possible for guilt to retain, so obstinately, the pretensions to innocence. But that human nature can arrive at such depravity is but too certain; and they who will not acknowledge this in the case *A——d B——r* will see it fully illustrated in the case of another prodigy of the age, the infamous *Bernard Fournier*. Here we may observe a man persevering during seventeen years in a fraud as insolent, as it was ill-contrived; undaunted by the terrors of the law; appearing, with astonishing effrontery, in the court of Justice, where his villainy was proclaimed and recorded; foiled and detected by the decree of an impartial judge, yet still, superior to his infamy; and triumphing, in an appeal to the public, as having gained the victory, amidst all the ignominy of his defeat. When I perused the account of this man's conspiracy against the bishop of *Winchester*, as stated in his lordship's masterly pamphlet (*a*), I could not, (and, I believe, no body can) avoid drawing a parallel between the two converts, the *Monk of Chalis*, and the *Jesuit of Materata*. And the impudent perseverance of the latter, tho' it cannot be exceeded by the behaviour of the former, is greatly illustrated by it.

(*a*) Bishop of Winchester's letter to Clement Chevallier Esq; &c.

But *B——r* and *Fournier* are not more alike, in their behaviour under demonstrated guilt, than they are in their being able, under such circumstances, still to meet with protectors. The conjunction of *detected imposture* and *acknowledged merit*, is a very singular appearance; and yet, from the great prelate's performance, we see that *Fournier*, tho' so clearly convicted of imposture, can still boast of a *patron of a perfectly good character, one who has the reputation of a very worthy person and of great integrity* (b). However, it seems, that this *very worthy person*, this man of *great integrity*, can think it consistent with such a character, to resist the repeated endeavours of the bishop to set him right; to disregard the most striking proofs of his friend's guilt, upon the simple pretence that he had never found him dishonest; and what is still more uncommon, tho' he professed himself *ready to acknowledge an alteration of opinion, as soon as the voice of public justice should declare itself*, we find him refusing *such acknowledgements, and encouraging the impostor to add new insults to his former, by giving his hand to some part of what he dispersed about the world to blacken* (c), the venerable and much injured prelate.

While such a wretch can boast of such protection, no one need despair: and, if *B——r* is equally fortunate, as he so confidently boasts, (d), what can such an unaccountable encouragement, stretched out to him, prove, but that other *patrons* besides *Clement Chevallier Esq;* have that *ready ear and uninquiring Tongue*, (e), which will always give encouragement to an insinuating flatterer to hazard his

(b) Bishop of Winchesters letter, p. 3.

(c) D^o. pref. p. 1.

(d) See his defences and particularly the reply p. 54. 55.

(e) Bishop of Winchester p. 39.

fictions? But tho' *Fournier* may have the character of honesty at *Aspall-Hall*, and *B---r* at—, the judgment of the nation is impartial; and while the detection of the former, by the bishop, not merely in *vindication of himself*, but to do service to society, by representing an *Instance of uncommon iniquity, and perseverance in wilful wickedness*, (f) hath met with that warm approbation which it deserved; this is no small encouragement to me to proceed at present in my detection of *A—d B—r*, as an instance of *uncommon iniquity and perseverance in wilful wickedness*, equally striking with that represented by the great detector of *Fournier*.—Indeed, I am not able to state evidence with that masterly perspicuity, and exact precision, which every one admires in *his* performance. However, I shall not despair of the same favourable attention which I met with in the former part of the controversy; for I shall take the same methods to deserve it, by a steady adherence to *truth*, uninfluenced by any motives of *resentment*, as unbiassed by any *prejudices* of attachment; careful only to point out to *protestants*, from a true principle of protestant zeal, the dangerous character of a pretended *champion*; and studious to do justice to my countrymen, in general, who have been for years, *insolently abused* by the fictions of a man, whom I have already proved, by the strongest evidence, to be the author of a *scene of imposture, perhaps the most impudent that can be met with in the annals of any country* (g); and the amazing extent of which will be seen in the present sheets.

But, before I produce the many additional proofs of this man's *extensive impostures*, a short, but distinct

(f) The bishop's words p. 2.

(g) Full conf. p. 4.

distinct view of the state of the dispute, so far as it hath been already considered, will be proper. For *some*, perhaps, into whose hands this may fall, have not perused the former *detections*: *others*, who have perused them, may be glad to see the arguments scattered through three large pamphlets brought into a narrow compass: and *every* reader, will approve of my giving such a view of what has been proved already, in order to connect the different parts of the controversy, and to serve as an introduction to the *many new discoveries*, which are now to be communicated.——And though, in this *wretched man's* last wretched performance, no one fact charged upon him hath been disproved, his weak credulous friends shall, however, be so far humoured, as to find some notice taken, in the course of the present work, of every thing which their *perverted understandings* have considered as a real answer to the heavy charge.

C H A P. III.

The evidence, produced to prove the genuineness of the letters, summed up.

TH E charge is as follows; that *A-----B-----*, above twenty years after his arrival in *England*, and *pretended* conversion to protestantism, wrote submissive and penitential letters to *Father Sheldon*, provincial of the *Jesuits*, from which body he had deserted. And in support of this charge, the very letters, being seven in number, are produced, by *Sir Henry Bedingsfeld*, a gentleman of acknowledged worth, and whose intimacy with *Father Sheldon* sufficiently accounts, for his getting possession of such letters. That these letters are, indeed, writ by
A-----d

A—d B—r, and not a forgery, as he pretends, hath been asserted and proved by the following arguments, which I shall abridge.

1. *Similitude of hand*, which is the first thing that offers itself upon a dispute of this nature, pleads strongly for the genuineness of the *letters*. They have been compared, frequently, and minutely, with many undoubted specimens of *B—r's* hand writing, and the greatest possible resemblance is visible and indisputable. Besides this, *many* persons, perfectly well acquainted with *B—r's* hand, some of them who have had dealings with him for years, have upon seeing the letters, declared that they are writ in a hand so like *B—r's*, that they are ready to swear, if called upon, to their full belief of the identity. *Similitude of hand*, when there is such a quantity of writing to be compared as *seven long letters*, is a kind of testimony which can hardly be resisted (*b*); and that those who are acquainted with *B—r's* writing, and have not had an opportunity of seeing the letters in dispute, may be enabled to form a judgment by trusting to their own eyes, I have thought it would not be amiss to have *one of the letters* and *one of the receipts* exactly engraved. And by turning to the *appendix* No. 1, they who can judge of the *similitude of hand* will be satisfied; and every other person will see that there is not the least appearance of constraint, which would certainly betray itself, had the writing been counterfeit (*).

B

2. The

(*b*) See this argument treated more at large in the *Six Let. ill.* p. 43, 44 and full conf. p. 80.

(*) Mr. *B—r* knows that it is his own fault if he has not seen the original of this and the other letters in the possession of Sir *H—y B—d*. For early last summer, Mr. *Sandby*, his Bookseller, was desired to acquaint him from

2. The *letters* have been produced in such a condition, as is inconsistent with the supposition of their being *forged* to prove that *B—r* corresponded with *Father Sheldou*; for they are neither directed to *him*, nor are they subscribed by the *former*; five have no direction at all, and the other two are directed to one *Elliot Brown*; and *A. B.* is the fullest designation which the writer gives of himself. Would forgers have omitted, the most obviously necessary part of the *forgery* (i)?

3. The forgery is supposed to have been contrived, as a punishment of *B—r*, for writing his *history* of the *Popes*; and yet it is certain from the post marks on one of the letters that it actually was writ and sent by the post in 1746, almost a year before he published his proposals, and two years before he published his *history* (k).

4. Three of the *letters* have no dates, and we are left to our guesses and conjectures, as to the order (l) in

Sir *H---*y, that he might at any time, see the letters, in the presence of any friend of his own, one of Sir *H---*y, and whose reasons, for desiring witnesses upon such an occasion, are very obvious.

(i) See this argument in six letters illust. p. 44, 45.

(k) See D°. p. 53, 54.

(l) I will not be positive, that I have ranged these letters when I published them, in the order of time in which they were writ. I have had no rule to direct me, but a careful perusal of them, and there was great difference of opinion about this, amongst some gentlemen who had access to see them. If therefore, I should happen to be mistaken, as to the arrangement I have preferred, this far from being a mark of the correspondence being forged, is indeed a proof of it's genuineness, as it shews that the persons who have produced the letters, are as much in the dark about them, as every other

in which they are to be read ; and a forger could not have omitted what was absolutely necessary, that his tale might be consistent, and have the least connexion

other indifferent person who is left to his own guesses and conjectures. Mr. B——r, is the only one who has it in his power to remove the obscurity of these letters, by an honest confession of his views and motives in writing them. And, till he does this, tho' the seeming inconsistencies in his conduct, should not be clearly accounted for, this will be no proof that the letters are not genuine. For this reason therefore, what he says, in his reply, p. 46, 47, about the improbability of his publishing his preface, and breaking off his correspondence with the *Jesuits*, after he had hopes given him of still being saved, as appears from the letter of the 27th of March, will not in the least serve his purpose, even tho' we could not account for this conduct. But his conduct here, *can* be accounted for. For tho', he had *hopes given him*, as mentioned in the seventh letter, of March 27, he had, in the postscript to the sixth, already told Mr. Sheldon that *he must make him easy within a Fortnight*, as the means of preventing the impending ruin.—If therefore this Fortnight elapsed without any certainty of his being made easy, we see a plain reason why B——r should close his correspondence which had not succeeded, and change his language. In which circumstances we can account for his throwing off the mask immediately after ; for his publishing his preface and his *threatening* to advertise Mr. Sheldon, in the news papers, and to hang him, as he told Mrs. Hoyle, a method of applying for his money which proved more effectual than his canting offers to return, and his pitiful story of the woman and child.—I should not have thought it necessary to take any notice of this miserable attempt to prove the forgery of the 7th. letter, if I had not learnt, with surprise, that one of B——r's friends, a gentleman of sense and learning, was greatly pleased with it. Can it be possible that prejudice should have such power ! And yet I will not suspect other motives.

5. The *matter* contained in the letters, is an irrefragable proof, that they are no forgery. They are obscure, dark, and, without a key given, absolutely unintelligible; they give imperfect hints of some money affair, speak of a woman and a child, and in short, are full of such particularities as we may well suppose in a genuine correspondence, the exact motives of the writer being unknown; but which could never possibly enter into the imagination of a forger, who, if he had been to write *seven* long letters in the name of *B——r*, that he might ruin his character with Protestants, would have come closer to the point, and expressly mentioned those topics which, in the letters, are only hinted at; and have made *that* his principal subject, which is just touched upon, in one or two passages (*m*).

6. While we observe such *internal marks* of genuineness, no *internal* appearance of spuriousness hath been discovered in the letters, with all Mr. *B——r*'s Jesuitical talents, in commenting and remarking upon them. *False dates*, which he objected, I shewed there were not; and tho' there be *false facts*, the letters may be writ by a deceiver (*n*); nay we affirm *B——r* to be such.

7. But the *letters* appear to be genuine, not only by the *similitude of hand*, and the *other circumstances* observed above, but, farther, are proved to be such, by the *positive testimony* of witnesses privy to the transaction. The *affidavit* of the person who saw *B——r* write one of the letters, heard him read it, and received it from him to send to *Skeldon*,

(*m*) See this argument in six letters, ill. p. 44, 45.

(*n*) See this argument in six letters, ill. p. 45, 46, and in full conf. 64, 65, 66.

is in the hands of Sir *Henry Bedingsfeld*; and another person, is upon the spot, who when called upon properly, is ready to make oath that two of the letters were put into his hands by B——r to be forwarded to *Sheldon*; which two letters he directed; and every body, upon comparing the directions of those letters, with specimens of this *Person's* writing, will see that what he can attest, must be true (o).

8. The testimony of *William Sheldon*, Esq; brother to *Father Sheldon*, is of the utmost consequence, who has declared that his brother shewed him a letter which he said was from B——r, by which he desired to have his money repaid him, in order to provide for the woman before he could return. Now tho' Mr. *William Sheldon* adds that he did not peruse this letter, nor see B——r's name to it, and consequently cannot, from his own knowlege, prove that any one of the seven letters produced by Sir *H. B.* is the individual letter his brother shewed him, yet certainly his evidence will prove the truth of the correspondence in general (p).

CHAP.

(o) See Sir *H. B.*'s letter, full conf. p. 73, 74.

(p) See Mr. *Sheldon's* letter in full conf. p. 77, 78. Mr. B——r who was aware of the force of this testimony, in his reply p. 42, 43. does all he can to invalidate it; but the miserable quibbles to which he is obliged to have recourse, serve only to shew the weakness of his cause. First he objects that, when the letters produced by Sir *H. B.* first became the talk of the public, this very gentlemen (Mr. *Will. Sheldon*) declared to a Noble Lord at Bath, who mentioned them to him, that he knew nothing at all of them. But that there is not the least inconsistency between this declaration, and the testimony afterwards given, is obvious. It appears from Mr. *Will. Sheldon's* letter, that he did not peruse B——r's letter to his brother, so that had the Noble Lord gone farther than he did, and even put all the seven letters into Mr. *Will. Sheldon's* hands, he could, with the

C H A P. IV.

Proofs of B——r's money transaction with the Jesuits, and reflexions on it.

BESIDES the above *positive* and *direct* proofs of the genuineness of B——r's correspondence with *Sheldon*, his secret transactions with his order, transactions inconsistent with his pretensions to Protestantism

the strictest regard to truth, have said, *that he knew nothing at all of them*. What Mr *Will. Sheldon* bears witness to is, that there was a correspondence between B——r and his brother, which may be true, and yet all the seven letters might have been forged. — But farther, how could Mr. *Will. Sheldon* do otherwise than tell the Noble Lord that he *knew nothing at all of the* letters in question? When this conversation happened at Bath, Mr. *Sheldon* had not seen them, nor could he know with any certainty their contents. For they were not published till many months after this conversation, and so far was Mr. *Sheldon* from having any opportunity of seeing the letters, before they were printed, that he had not seen Sir *H. B.* nor corresponded with him for some years. Had the Noble Lord asked Mr *William Sheldon*, whether or no he had ever heard his brother the provincial say that he had received any letters from B——r, and to this question had received an answer in the negative; then, indeed, his Lordship might well be surprised to find Mr. *Sheldon's* testimony produced. But as the case is now stated, which is the strict truth, there is an entire agreement between the declaration made to the noble Lord at Bath, and the letter published in the full confutation. I need not mention the reasons why Mr. *Sheldon* should have been so shy of giving his Lordship any satisfaction; they may be guessed at by those who know B——r's good luck in having so good a friend. — Whatever may be the sentiments of any other friend of B——r,

about

testantism, have been proved by facts, which are the strongest collateral evidences for the genuineness of the letters, and which would equally have displayed the imposture of his character, tho' *no* letters had been produced.

The first thing that offers itself, is the money transaction between *B——r* and the *Jesuits*, which the letters mention, and which has been demonstrated by the following proofs :

about this, I think I can be certain that I shall have given entire satisfaction to the Noble Peer himself.

The second objection *B——r* makes to Mr. *Sheldon's* testimony is that it speaks of his desiring his money, *in order to provide for the woman before he could return*. Now says *B——r* (reply p. 43) *this contradicts point blank what father Carteret told a Noble Duke, that I returned in 1744, or 1745*. Mark here a gross falsification ! It is no where said that Carteret told the Noble Duke that *B——r* had returned. All that the father told the Duke, as may be seen, p. 74. of the six letters ill. is, that at Mr. *B——r's* earnest desire he had carried on the negotiation between him and the general of his order. — Father Carteret indeed did receive the penitent *B——r* again in 1744, or 1745. — But this cannot be called a return. It appears that the negotiation with the general was subsequent to Carteret's readmission of *B——r*, for one of the letters mentions Mr. *Retz* the general's desiring to know what province would be most to *B——r's* satisfaction. And till this was settled, *B——r* could not be said, to have returned. — The only return that Father *Sheldon* and his brother speak of, and which we shall find another witness speak of by and by, is a return to some province, beyond Seas, which indeed I believe *B——r* did not think of, tho' he could say, *Non mea voluntas sed tua fiat*, and declare his being indifferent as to places. — When a cause cannot be defended without wresting and torturing an equivocal word, it betrays its weakness more than if it gave no answer.

1. By the evidence of Mrs. *Hayles*, whom he consulted whether he might put it into the hands of his body, for an annuity, saying it *was all their own, he having no property; and who afterwards heard him call it a woman's money* (q).
2. By the evidence of the person who introduced him to the provincial *Father Shireburn*, heard him make an apology for his conduct, and offer his money; for which affair *Shireburn* referred him to the procurator of the order, *Father Hill* (r).
3. By *Father Hill's* account books, which mention *B—r's* having paid to Mr. *Shireburn*, at three different payments, the first in August 1741, the sum of £1350, and his being repaid what was due to him, on the 20th. June 1747 (s).
4. By the evidence of Mr. *Maire*, an eminent counsellor of Gray's Inn, who was told by *Father Hill*, that *B—r had an annuity from the body and pressed to have his money again* (t).
5. It is proved by receipts for the interest of this annuity, which *B—r* acknowledges he receives from *Father Shireburn*, from his representatives and from his successor, *Sheldon* (u); and what is still more decisive, if possible,
6. It is proved by entries in Mr. *Wright* the banker's books, tallying with the above receipts, and confirming them (x).

(q) See Mrs. *Hayles's* nar. six letters. ill. p. 78.

(r) See Sir *H. B.'s* letter, full conf. p. 3.

(s) See six letters, ill. p. 64. (t) Full conf. p. 42.

(u) See six letters, ill. p. 68, 69. One of the receipts is exactly engraved in the appendix, N°. 1.

(x) six letters ill. p. 72.

The

That *A*——*dB*——*r*, a convert from popery, and a deserter from the *Jesuits*, should, many years after his conversion, be so intimate with the *Jesuits*, and place such confidence in them as to put into their hands all that he was worth in the world, without any security but the personal bond of a man, who, as a *Jesuit*, had no property, and might leave *England* at a moment's warning; that this confidence should be put by *B*——*r* in a set of Men, who, according to his own account of them, *will stick at nothing when the advantage of their order is at stake* (y); and with whose attempts to kidnap and poison him, he was, at the very period, he was thus trusting them, amusing his Protestant friends; this transaction, independent of any other proof, will, in the judgment of every one, not hardened against conviction, be thought decisive of the truth of the charge against this insolent man; who, before the above invincible demonstrations of his accepting an annuity from the *Jesuits* were brought to light, while he thought he might safely avail himself of Protestant ignorance, at the expence of truth, told as many different storys about this *money bargain* (z), as his brother in iniquity, *Fournier*, did about the *note*.

Pressed by that chain of proofs, which, unfortunately for Mr. *B*——*r*, I had been able to produce, he at last, tho' very awkwardly, admitted the truth of the money transaction, but hopes to get off, by calling this step an *indiscretion* (a).——I mention this

(y) First defence p. 78.

(z) See six letters ill. p. 61, 62. See also full conf. from p. 30, to 39. where the money transaction is placed in it's true light, and the sophistry and prevarication of *B*——*r* about it, fully exposed.

(a) See his first part, p. 112.

lame and unsatisfactory excuse, only to condemn him out of his own mouth. When he excused himself to his friends for giving his money to the *Jesuits*, he laid the blame on his known *indiscretion* (b).—And yet this man so apt to be *indiscrete* has the modesty to defend himself against the charge of writing the letters to *Sheldon*, on his incapacity of committing so great an *indiscretion*.—(c) Which shall we most admire? The inconsistency of the man, thus answering himself, by himself? Or the prejudice of his few remaining friends, who can rest satisfied with a defence, which cannot be *true*, because the arguments on which it is built confute each other (d)?

Upon the whole, the discovery of this *money transaction*, gives the highest confirmation of the genuineness of the letters; and tho' no such letters had ever been produced, would of itself, have been sufficient to convince Protestants how grossly they have been deceived as to the real character of the *historian of the Popes*.

C H A P. V.

Other transactions of B——r with Papists and Jesuits.

THE conduct of B——r, must appear detestable to every sincere protestant, from other *facts*, which, in the course of the debate, were proved, and which I shall now place in one view.

1st.

(b) *Ibid*, *Ibid*.

(c) See this argument strongly put in his second part p. 14, 15, and 21.

(d) As he admits he was so *indiscrete* as to lend the money to one provincial, he should have remembered that it is very probable

1. *B—r*'s having said mass in *London*, is proved by Mr. *John Gay*, who was in the room at the time (e). The same person, in whose house the provincials of the *Jesuits* lodged for many years, remembers *B—r*'s visiting his lodgers, from the time of his coming into *England*, till about twelve Years ago. (f)

2. Mr. *Lewis* the Bookseller, bears witness to Mr. *B—r*'s being acquainted with other *Jesuits* besides *Hill* and *Carteret*, at the time the letters are said to be written, tho' *B—r* with his usual boldness, denies this; and the same person was employed by the *Jesuits* to get back from him, the books which they had lent him, when he began (or at least pretended to begin) his history of the *Popes*, in their favour. (g)

3. That *B—r* was received, as a good *Papist*, to the communion of the Church, and as a submissive *Jesuit*, begging forgiveness from his order, was testified by *Father Carteret*, who said this happened, some time before the battle of *Fontenoy*, that is in the spring 1745 (b).

C 2

4. This

probable that he might be so indiscrete as to write to another provincial, to get this money back. Nay the indiscretion of writing the letters had an excuse; it was necessary, that he might get back his money. But which excuse can there be for the first indiscretion of lending it?

(e) Ful conf. p. 82.

(f) Six letters ill. p. 83, 84.

(g) Full conf. p. 73.

(b) See six letters illust, p. 74. The transaction between *Carteret* and *B—r*, so far as my protestant ignorance can speak properly on such points, seems to have been this

4. This remarkable Æra of Mr. B——r's life, has had great light thrown upon it, by the testimony of Mr. *Horne*, a Surgeon, who lodged in the same house with *Carteret*, and in whose apartment Mr. B——r had frequent private conferences with this Jesuit. After which *Conferences*, he said to Mr. *Horne*, *I am now one of yours*; and Mr. *Horne* congratulated B——r, on the event (*i*).
5. Mr. *Carteret*, sometime before his death, owed to the duke of A—— that at Mr. B——r's earnest desire, *he had carried on a negotiation between him and the general of the order*; by this confession confirming the most remarkable passage in the letters, where mention is made of the *general's* desiring to know, by means of *Carteret*, *what province would be most for B——r's satisfaction*. (*k*)

this, B——r testified his being a good Catholic by going through the apparatus of confession &c; and in consequence of this, was admitted to communion. As to *readmitting him into the order*, an expression I made use of, perhaps improperly if he never was expelled by the Pope, *Carteret* as a private *Jesuit*, could do no more than to represent, to the *general*, B——r's submission, and *offering to return*. I say *offering to return*; for his submission to *Carteret*, in *London*, could in no sense be called a *return*, neither did his superior, treat it as such; for, as we shall see just now, after the transaction with *Carteret*, the negotiation with the *general* commenced; which shewed that the *general* look'd for B——r's going beyond Sea, as the only proof of his sincerity, giving him the option however, of that *province which should be most to his satisfaction*.

(*i*) Six letters ill. p. 82.

(*k*) Ibid p. 74.

6. Another *Father* of Mr. B—r's order, still alive and upon the spot, the same whose name is mentioned by Mrs. *Hoyles*, as having introduced B—r to *Skireburn*, has confessed our Protestant historian more than once, within these Twelve Years, and if the worthy penitent will apply for an authentic certificate of his being *confessed*, he knows where to call upon his old *confessor* (l).

7. In confirmation of B—r's connexions with this *Jesuit*, a gentleman of figure, in upper *Brooke Street*, whose name Mr. B—r, or any of his friends, if they have the curiosity to enquire, may learn, has declared that, in *August* 1746, he heard B—r say to the above mentioned *Father confessor* in *Lewis's* shop,—Mr. B—r *we can never find you, at home*, and remembers the *Father's* answer—Mr. B—r *you know my Hours* (m).

8. But no exploit of our *convert*, is more extraordinary, nor any better attested, than his having been the means of perverting first Mrs. *Hoyles*, and then her Husband, from the *Protestant* Religion. This transaction, so much to the honor of our *champion* against Popery, stands confirmed to us by the very circumstantial narratives given of that affair, by the person herself who should best know it, and whose veracity, we have the highest reason to believe (n). For,

(l) Full conf. p. 76.

[m] Ful conf. p. 7.

(n) See Mrs. *Hoyles* two narratives, six letters ill. p. 75, 76, 77, 78. and full conf. p. 83, 84, 85.

9. In confirmation of Mrs. *Hoyle's* evidence, we can appeal to a Protestant of undoubted reputation, Mr. *Faden* the Printer, who, declares that he has heard Mrs. *Hoyle's* frequently speak of *B—r*, as the good friend who had put her and her Husband in the way of being *Roman Catholics*. This declaration, which Mr. *Hoyle's* frequently made to Mr. *Faden*, so long ago as 1737 at latest, that is, many years before she, or any other papist, can be supposed to have had any temptation to give a false testimony, and which Mr. *Faden* always *publicly* spoke of, before the letters were ever heard of, places this important transaction upon the surest footing of credibility.

When we have so many striking instances of *B—r's* popish connexions and inclinations, long after his pretended *conversion*, authenticated by such a variety of evidence, who can doubt of the genuineness of his letters to *Father Sheldon* (o).

C H A P. VI.

No reason to suspect that the Jesuits have forged the Letters.

TO a charge supported by so great a weight of evidence, what hath Mr. *B—r* been able to oppose?—He hath given us his own very credible affirmation, that he is innocent, and would have us believe, tho' he doth not attempt to prove it, that the *Jesuits* have confederated together to blast his re-

(o) See Mr. *Faden's* testimony, six letters ill. p. 81. and full conf. p. 86.

putation,

putation, in revenge for the history of the popes. Behind this *unsupported* pretence, Mr. B—r, unable to confute the charge by real evidence, hath thought proper to intrench himself. And as he could not object to the fullness of the testimony, he labors to destroy its credibility by putting us in mind of the *jesuitical doctrines concerning equivocation, mental restrictions, reservations &c. by virtue of which they can attest and can swear whatever you please, without being guilty (according to their principles) of Perjury (p).*——I had already effectually exposed this method of defence, in my former pamphlets, particularly in the first (*q*). But my hardened antagonist still making this his strong hold, in his last performance (*r*), and the credulity of some few of his *un-enquiring* friends still urging it as a reason for their paying no regard to the most striking proofs of his guilt, it may not be improper to suggest some remarks which will demonstrate the groundlessness of the objection.

I am not ignorant, of the great sagacity of the venerated society of *Jesús*; and the skill of some of their casuists in sapping the foundations of morality by their *distinctions*, is as well known, as it is justly condemned. But Mr. B—r will hardly be able to persuade any sensible Protestant that they have had recourse to such diabolical doctrines in order to form a charge against him.——For such is the frame of human nature, that no individual, much less any number of men, can be supposed capable of a deliberate piece of villainy, unless prompted by some view of interest, or advantage to be obtained by

(*p*) Reply p. 34.

(*q*) See six letters ill. p. 48, 53.

(*r*) See his reply from p. 34, to 40.

transgressing the bounds of moral honesty. So that the *Jesuits* cannot be suspected, justly, of confederating to ruin *B—r*, by a base conspiracy, unless we suppose that the object was worthy of the resentment, and that the temptation was strong enough to excite them to the guilt; the contrary of which is most evident.—Mr. *B—r*, very consistently, no doubt, speaking of the *Jesuits*, says—*They are not even men of bad principles, when neither the honour of their church, nor that of their idol the order is concerned, but are taught to stick at nothing when the advantage or credit of the one or the other is at stake (s).* Let us apply this general discription, to the partiular case before us.

First, then, I would gladly see *B—r* able to prove that the interests of the *order* could receive any benefit from exposing him. For to me it seems that to detect the hypocrisy, and misconduct of a *Jesuit*, reflects dishonour, not credit, on the *body*. And sound policy would dictate rather to conceal if they could, their having *unworthy* persons among them, than to be, themselves, the trumpeters of their own shame, by declaring to Protestants that *desertion* creeps sometimes amongst their members.—Again, the indefatigable zeal with which the *Jesuits* labor to bring back their strayed sheep to the fold of the Church, is well known. Is it, therefore, to be supposed that they would act diametrically opposite to this principal object of their *policy*, and, instead of endeavouring to recover a lost member, do all that in them lay, to cut off all hopes of recovering him, by a base contrivance to expose him?

(s) 1st part p. 78..

But, secondly, perhaps it will be said, that by exposing *B—r*'s character, the *Jesuits* would advance the honour of their church—Which is the other case, in which *B—r* tells us they *will stick at nothing*. This indeed, is the favorite topic of defence. The *History of the Popes*, we are told, hath made *A—d B—r* the object of the resentment of the whole papistical world. And downfall of idolatry and superstition, and an entire overthrow to the whole system of *Popery*, being dreaded as a consequence from this wonderful book; no wonder that the illustrious author should be marked out as worthy to be attacked with all the artillery of *Rome*, and the poisoned arms of the troops of *Loyola*. Such have been the airs of importance which this *insolent* man hath assumed, airs which, however they may please his ignorant, and deceived admirers, must disgust every person in the least acquainted with the real character of this so much boasted history, and which I can scarcely prevail upon myself to honor with any serious confutation.

When the peace of *Utrecht* was in agitation, *John Dennis*, we are told, waited on the Duke of *Marlborough*, to represent his fears lest the *French* should insist upon his being given up, exasperated as they must be against him on account of his writings against the *Grand Monarque*. His Grace comforted the trembling author, by telling him that tho' *he* himself also had done something to exasperate *France*, he hoped there would be no danger of being given up. Can a reader of the least discernment hear *B—r*, representing himself as an object of the resentment of the whole *Romish* Church, and not call to mind the apprehensions of *Dennis*? Indeed the wrong-headed *Englishman* was ridiculously in earnest, being really

D

afraid;

afraid; but, the bad-hearted *Scotchman* is insolently deceitful; for he knows he has no reason to fear. The *Papists* must see with contempt a Book patched up in the most slovenly manner, without learning, judgment or accuracy, from their own authors, and the perusal of which can have no other effect upon the sensible reader, but to leave him in doubt, whether the amazing plagiarism or the shameful ignorance of the writer, lessen its value most. They who had it so much in their power to detect this man's impostures as an *historian*, could have no temptation to aim at any detection of his *private character*. And whoever can believe that the *Jesuits* could think it worth their while, for the *honor of their Church*, to forge against *B—r*, will be at loss to assign any reason why he should not also think that it deserved the attention of the *French*, to get into their possession, their formidable antagonist, *John Dennis*.

But the *Jesuits*, says *B—r*, attempted to bring the Duke de Sulli into disgrace with his Royal Master, by means of forged letters; can it then be wondered that they should thus attack me? (1) Yes very much. The Duke of Sulli was worthy of their resentment; certainly not the historian of the *Popes*; and least of all for his history. The insolence and vanity of this man is insufferable; and when I see the plagiarist of *Tillemont* thus modestly drawing a parallel between himself, and the great minister of *Henry the fourth*, I cannot avoid calling to my mind the scene in the comedy, where *Noll Bluff* modestly prefers himself to *Hannibal*.

3. Tho' we have so clearly proved, that the *Jesuits* could have no temptation to attack *B—r*, by

(1) Reply p. 48.

means

means of *forged letters*, let me so far humour him as to wave this argument for a moment, and to admit that such a temptation really did exist. Yet, even tho' this were the case, it would be the height of folly to suppose, that they would have forged *such* letters, as those which have been produced. For can any one be so absurd as to suppose that the *Jesuits* have forged the seven letters to *Skeldon*, which while they detect the *deserter*, at the same time detect the *body* from which he deserted, and lay open such secrets as it would be their principal care to keep out of view? The contents of the letters are such, that their genuineness cannot be supported, nor even their meaning understood, without hurting, essentially, the dearest concerns of the *Jesuits* in *England*. The *ecclesiastical polity* of their order hath been laid open, some of their principal *missionaries* have been pointed at, Protestants have been made acquainted with their *money concerns*, by means of those very letters which they themselves are absurdly said to have forged. No such plan of forgery to hurt *B—r*, could come from a quarter that did not also mean to hurt the *order* to which he belonged. For the detection of the imposture of *B—r*, as given us in the seven letters, so necessarily includes in it the detection of the mystery of *Jesuitism*, lurking in this protestant kingdom, that infinitely more benefit will result from this to the cause of the reformation, than could have resulted from *B—r's History of the Popes*, if it had indeed been, what it is so far from being, a work of merit. And, whoever reflects on the political sagacity of the *Jesuits*, will be of opinion, that they would rather have chosen to see ten *Histories of the Popes*, executed with the utmost severity, than have laid open to the inspection of Protestants, those particulars about the state of the society in *England*,

which the letters to *Father Sheldon* have been the means of bringing to light.

4. Agreeable to this representation, nothing is more certain, than that the *Jesuits*, true to the permanent, real interest of their *order*, far from being the contrivers or encouragers of the detection of *B—r*, have, ever since the letters to *Sheldon* became the public talk, expressed the utmost concern that they were made known to Protestants, and have refused with obstinacy, or given up with reluctance, those collateral evidences of their genuineness which have been mentioned in the course of the controversy. Indeed, the truth is, the only person to whom Mr. *B—r* is under obligation, for the *public attack*, and *formal detection* of his real character, is a friend and patron of his own. Sir. *H. B's* view in shewing the letters, was confined at first, to the conviction of one or two gentlemen in private, whom he was in hopes, from their *supposed* candor, to satisfy by this means, that the historian of the *Popes* was unworthy of their protection. The treatment which the worthy *baronet* met with, as ungenerous as it was unexpected, obliged him to go much farther in the unraveling of this dark transaction than at first he proposed, and much farther than those of his persuasion think he ought, in prudence, to have gone. How successful he hath been in his inquiries, *B—r* and his friends have seen already, to their great confusion. And they will have greater reason for making melancholy reflexions on the imprudence of their having forced this gentleman to *persevere* in his researches, when they shall have perused the *additional discoveries* in the present sheets. (u)

5. But

(u) See the argument of the present chapter treated of in six letters ill. 48, 55, *B—r* and *Tillemont* passim. And full conf. p. 36.

5. But what pretence can this strange man have for calling the accusation against him, a conspiracy of the *Jesuits*, when it appears from the foregoing state of the evidence, that most of the witnesses who attest the facts charged upon him, are not *Jesuits*, and consequently, cannot be suspected of entertaining those maxims of equivocation and mental restriction which are peculiar to the *Jesuits*, and which, as B—r himself tells us, *the good Pope Innocent the ninth condemned.* (w) Upon Mr. B—r's own confession, therefore, there can be no reason for calling in question the credibility of Mr. *Horne*, of Mr. *Lewis*, of Mr. *William Sheldou*, of Mrs. *Hoyle*s, and others; especially, if we recollect a farther confession which hath, unawares fallen from him, when he says, *ninety nine, in a hundred, of the ROMAN CATHOLICS, in this kingdom, and particularly the gentleman in whose band the letters are, are as incapable of having forged them, or of countenancing such a forgery, as any of my friends would be to forge letters against them.* (x)

6. Again, what occasion can there be to prove, that the *Jesuits* have not forged the letters in question, when a confession of the impossibility of doing this, drops unawares from B—r's own mouth? He says (speaking of *Carteret's* letters) *it is morally impossible for the JESUITS to forge twelve letters, besides those they have already forged, in which nothing could be discovered that would betray the forgery, and unravel the whole plot.* (y) Now if it be morally impossible to forge twelve letters, that should not betray the forgery; and since it is certain that seven letters betray no marks, either *external* or *internal*, of

(w) Reply p. 34.

(x) Second part, p. 22.

(y) Reply p. 18.

forgery,

forgery, I should conceive that it is a moral impossibility, that these *seven* should be a forgery.—And had the genuineness of these letters been ever canvassed in a court of justice (a way of deciding the controversy to which Mr. B—r hath shewn a prudent reluctance) there could have been no occasion to have laid the least stress on the testimony of *Jesuits* or *Papists*. For the court would have received entire satisfaction, by having the similitude of hand fully proved by the most unexceptionable *protestant testimony*; and the truth of the *money transaction* confirmed by the authentic evidence of a *Banker's Books*.

C H A P. VII.

Mr. B—r's general character unfavorable to the supposition of his innocence, in the case before us.

HAVING stated the many striking proofs of the genuineness of the seven letters, and effectually confuted the unsupported assertion of their being a forgery of the *Jesuits*, I beg leave now to produce some disagreeable instances of Mr. B—r's principles, and practices, which must incline us to believe him guilty of the present charge, and to pay little regard to his bold pretensions to innocence.

Had his private character been free from the smallest speck, yet if he could not have opposed to *real* and satisfactory proofs of his being guilty, any other defence but his own unsupported denial of the charge, this would have been insufficient to acquit him. For every man is to be supposed innocent, till proofs of his guilt are produced; and a
good

good character, tho' it ought to make us cautious in admitting proofs of guilt, cannot, and ought not, to save any one upon whom the facts are *proved*.— Now, if a denial of the charge, by the person accused, of a character till *now* irreproachable, can weigh nothing in the scale against full and positive proofs of guilt; much less can the unsupported denial of a man, *known* to have been guilty of other enormities, have the least weight, when opposed to real evidence. And that B——r is such a man, will appear from the following particulars.

1. Mr. B——r, by his own account of himself, is a *Jesuit*. Now, if the oaths and attestations of *Jesuits*, are not to be believed, which, as we have seen, is his principal topic of defence, this argument concludes against the credibility of his own testimony. It is a weapon which cannot be used against his enemies, without wounding himself. Indeed his *own* testimony is less to be believed—For, as we have already observed, the *Jesuits* had no temptation to falsify against B——r, whereas B——r's temptation to falsify is obvious. It is in his own cause, that he gives evidence, and a cause of such consequence, that every thing is at stake. That a *Jesuit*, in such circumstances, should persist in a falsehood, to save himself from infamy, is not much to be wondered at. Nay that he actually doth persist in it, will appear extremely probable, if we reflect,

2. That B——r is not only a *Jesuit*, but a *Jesuit*, who gives such an account of himself, as shews that he is not to be believed. *The Jesuitical doctrines of equivocation, mental reservation, reservation &c. I have long since renounced*, says he (z) of him-

(z) Reply p. 41.

self.

self. Whatever other *Jesuits* may teach, to our *Jesuit* was reserved the unparalleled honor of *openly* confessing that he did reduce to practice such *diabolical doctrines*. And as he acknowledges so coolly that he was once thus *depraved*, what proofs can he give us that he is not so still? As he was bred up amongst the *Jesuits*, and was at least twenty years amongst them in *Italy*, would not the daily practice of departing from truth, during so great a part of his life, give him the strongest habit of falsehood? And how know we that this habit hath ever yet left him? Besides, how comes it that the villainous maxims of the *body* he belonged to, were no part of the cause of his withdrawing from it? Does this do any honor to his character? Could he live 20 Years, without feeling remorse for *equivocation*, *mental restriction*, and all the *detestable* doctrines of the *Jesuits*, and find no other reason for leaving them, but his discovering that the *supremacy* of the *Pope* had no foundation in *antiquity*? He who can draw such a character of himself, who can, without shame, say, that *he abjured* this last-mentioned doctrine *in his mind*, and in the same breath, tell us that he nevertheless continued, for years, to accept of offices, which he could not enjoy, without *swearing* to the belief of it, can have no right to be believed, in any case, much less in his own, and against the *clearest evidence* (a).

3. But

(a) Mr. B——r, p. 41. of his reply, has the effrontery to call upon me, to name the place where he avows the doctrine of *mental abjuration*: and yet, to the proof which I produced of this charge, in the full confutation from p. 54, to 56, he hath not attempted any reply. Indeed he could not; for out of his own mouth we condemn him.

His own words are—*I abjured in my mind, the Pope's supremacy, his superiority over the whole Church, while I lived*
at

3. But, perhaps, the breathing of *English* air, of itself, purged away all the detestable maxims by which Mr. B—r had regulated his conduct in *Italy*; and his *Lay dress* had the efficacy of infusing into his depraved

at Rome, and before I made my last vows, 1st. part, p. 73. Now, by his own account of himself, he continued a faithful *Jesuit*, four or five years, after this time, and taught philosophy at Rome, Arrezzo, and Macerata, and I proved from the Bullarium that he could not have been admitted to teach, without *subscribing* upon oath, and renewing his subscription yearly, *Pope Pius's creed*, in which the *supremacy of the Pope is taught in the strongest manner*. So that here is the fullest proof, that Mr. B—r, practised the convenient doctrine of *mental abjuration*, for several years, and that he made frequent and solemn appeals to heaven of his believing the *Popes supremacy*, long after he had *abjured* it in his mind. Surely, I had but too much reason for making it one of the heads, of my contents in the Full Confutation, that *mental abjuration was avowed by Mr. B—r's practice*.

Nothing ever equalled this Man's boldness, in attempting to evade the charge of having practised the horrid maxim of *mental abjuration*, but his insolent attempt, p. 15, 16, of his Reply, to evade the charge which I brought, of his confounding the *supremacy*, and infallibility of the *Pope* with one another. My charge, p. 52, 54, of the Full Conf. was founded on this: That he affirmed, *a man may deny the Popes supremacy, and nevertheless be a good Catholic*. He owns he affirmed this; but how does he prove it? Why, very curiously indeed, by shewing that *Roman Catholics* differ in their opinions about the nature and extent of this *supremacy*. But who ever denied this? I did not, and it was impossible I should; because some, as the *Italians*, extend it not only over the church (which is the only matter in question between u) but over the state: others, as the Roman courtiers

depraved heart, a set of sound principles. Alas ! he unfortunately cannot make such a defence ; for such facts have been produced and proved, as shew that *A—d B—r*, Esq; has as little claim to credibility

tiers, extend it to an infallibility, and this I allowed, Full Conf. p. 53, *a man may deny and yet be a good Catholic*. Whereas all I affirmed was that the *Pope's supremacy* (his *primauté*, as *Courayer* calls it in his works) or the doctrine of his being head of the church, could not be denied, nor ever was denied, not even by the *Jansenists*, by a good *Catholic*. And this, even the wretched Man himself, in the very place where he pretends to confute me, acknowledges, saying—*That the Pope is the head or first Bishop of the church is an article of Catholic communion* (Reply p. 17.) And is not this the very proposition he denied in his first Pamphlet p. 73, when he said, *a Man may deny the Popes supremacy and nevertheless be a good Catholic* ? For what is the *Popes supremacy*, but his being *the head or first Bishop of the Church* ? All this is perfectly astonishing. From this note the reader will be able to form a just judgment, of the miserable shifts to which the hardened *Jesuit* is reduced, and of the trifling chicane which he employs in his defence ; saying and unsaying, asserting and denying, without any other view but to get rid of a present difficulty, untterrify'd by the contradictions in which he involves himself. Another instance, added to the two foregoing, will suffice. In his first part, p. 78, and 79, after saying, amongst many other fine things, of the *Jesuits*, that they had not even bad principles, but when the Church and order are concerned, he goes on to say, *that the Monks and Friars, and the Popish secular clergy in England are a very different race of men from the Jesuits*. Upon this I took occasion, in the Full Conf. p. 33, to observe, *that till Mr. B—r set us right, the Jesuits had always been looked upon by Protestants, as the most dangerous of all the orders of the Church of Rome*. In his Reply p. 19, he charges me with having misrepresented his meaning, denying that he had represented the *Jesuits* as *less dangerous than the Monks, Friars, and secular clergy* ; and pretending that he meant only

dibility as a witness, since his coming to *England*, as he could have, while he was only *Father B---r*, swearing to the belief of a doctrine that he had abjured in his mind, in *Italy*.—The strongest assurance we can have of the credibility of any witness, is his having serious and sound principles of religion; and when a man is known to have thrown aside his faith, few persons will be inclined to trust to his honesty. Now that Mr. B---r, for several years after his coming into *England*, openly professed his infidelity by *profane buffoonery*, and *mockery of our Holy Religion*, this is a fact which neither himself, nor his friends, will care to deny, because they know it can, nay, they know, it has been proved (*b*).—Perhaps it will be a question not unseasonable, to ask here, what were this worthy Gentleman's motives for being a convert to infidelity. The *Father's*, he tells us, opened his eyes as to the groundlessness of the *Popes supremacy*; but surely it was not their writings which taught him to doubt of the truth of Christianity. But whatever answer he may give to this hard question, I shall only appeal to my readers,

E 2

whe

only to give the preference to the *Jesuits*, in point of birth, education and learning. But when he thought of this evasion he had, unluckily, forgot a passage which explains what goes before and fully warrants the sense I put upon it. Out of his own mouth therefore shall we prove that he calls the *Jesuits* less dangerous than the *Monks*, &c. *I was under no apprehensions of danger* (says he p. 79) *from the Jesuits, but from the Friars among where there are and ever have been some mad enthusiasts, and from the secular clergy and Popish Bishops have, whom the High Court of inquisition frequently employs as the instruments of it's revenge!* Such instances are a demonstrable proof that B---r is still a *Jesuit*, if prevarication be an ingredient in such a character.

(*b*) Six Letters illust. pag. 29, 30. And Full Confut. pag. 49, 50.

whether one who appears to have left all religion behind him, when he left *Poper*y, tho' he had been bred up a divine, and was now in the decline of life, can, from this view of his character, have any pretensions to have his unsupported testimony, in his own cause, received with much attention?

4. But Mr. B——r, however loose he might be in his religious principles after coming into *England*, boasts of his *moral honesty*, from which he is *sure he never departed* (c). I am afraid his practices will no more bear examination than his principles. For by his own confession, this *moral honesty*, which he boasts of, did not include in it a conduct suited to the *strict purity and sanctity enjoined by the Gospel*, (d) from which he allows *he has departed*. Mr. B——r's notions of *moral honesty* allowing him to depart from the strict purity of the Gospel, what assurance can he give us that his morality will not also warrant his departure from Truth?

5. If it should be said that I go too far back into Mr. B——r's life, for matter to depreciate his character, it will not be improper to give a specimen of the maxims which he adopts even at present.—*It is no reflection upon a man's general character, to have liked a woman enough to make her hope he would marry her, and yet disappoint her in those expectations, no promise of marriage having been given.*—I defy Mr. B——r to extract from a *Suarez*, an *Escobar*, a *Sanchez*, or a *Filliutius*, a more detestable doctrine than this which he, without a blush, hath asserted (f). The Man who artfully engages a Woman's affec-

(c) Second part, p. 28.

(d) Ibid, Ibid.

(f) See answer to a new charge, p. 8.

tions, and *after making her hope he would marry her*, takes care to have it in his power to deceive her, without exposing himself to the law, is infinitely more guilty than the breaker of a formal promise, because in this case the injured Woman can have a legal remedy. Had B——r been upon his guard, he would have confessed the truth, that there was a *promise of marriage* made by him (and he knows there was a promise of Ten Years standing) (g) rather than, by disowning it, have given us so remarkable an instance of his being capable of denying any truth, however certain, and of still retaining doctrines as detestable, as the *mental abjuration* he practised in *Italy*.

6. After this astonishing instance of B——r's principles of gallantry, can any one be surprised to find that he gave hopes of marriage, to two or three Women (b), at the same time, and married a fourth at last? This conduct, which, it seems, was not contrary to his notions of *moral honesty*, must shock every ingenuous mind. And yet the Man guilty of it, is, by his weak friends, supposed to have such strict notions of *moral honesty*, as would keep him from asserting a falsehood, even when he could not, otherwise, save himself from infamy.

(g) Full conf. p. 47.

(b) See the Proofs, full conf. p. 47.

C H A P. VIII.

Mr. B——r's character, farther illustrated by facts.

I AM sorry that I have it in my power, to produce a variety of facts which must give every reader the lowest opinion of Mr. B——r's veracity, and dispose them to think that one so fairly detected of a disregard to truth in other instances, may well be supposed guilty of it, in the case of the letters to *Speidon* now before us.

1. Then, what regard ought to be paid to a Man who, in the course of this controversy, is found (i) *contradicting* himself so frequently, and by offering a defence, whose several parts are at variance with each other, gives the most convincing proof that it hath been pieced together, without regard to truth?

2. What can we think of that man's veracity, who declares *that he had been 20 years in England be-*

(i) For the inconsistency between the tale of his escape as formerly told, and as now printed by him, see full conf. p. 24, 26. —

See also Six Letters ill. p. 65, 66, where the evidence of a Noble Lord with a Red Ribbon, proves how inconsistently B——r has spoke about the inquisition.

See also B——r and Tillemont compared p. 74, 75, where an amazing contradiction, between his affidavit and his remarks, is pointed out. He has the effrontery to excuse this as a *slip of his pen, or an error of the press*; tho' he never found it out himself, till the charge of inconsistency forced him to say something; and if such excuses are to be admitted, no falshood need fear to be *converted into truth*.

fore

fore be thought of a bedfellow (k), tho' he owns an intrigue with *Mary Sutton*, which commenced within one year of his coming to *England* (l); and tho' the courtship for which he hath suffered so severely in his pocket (m), began many years before the term he fixes for his thinking of a bedfellow (n)?

3. Can there be any credit due to Mr. B——r, who so confidently asserted that he went into the City to lend his money to the trustees of *St. Botolph's Aldgate*, but that he found the subscription closed; as it hath been proved from their books,

(k) First part, p. 33.

(l) B——r aware of this inconsistency, doth not blush to say, that when he speaks of a bedfellow, he means only a wife. But tho' he may thus get rid of *Mary Sutton*, at the expence of his own morals, he cannot get rid of other courtships which have been proved upon him.

(m) Mr. B——r having thought proper to deny, in his reply, p. 84 that he pays this gentlewoman, and very regularly, an annuity during his life; and with the utmost assurance representing Sir H. B——d's information, about this fact, as coming from witnesses to whose testimony no regard is to be paid; I am desired by that gentleman to declare, that his intelligence of Mr. B——r's paying down five hundred pounds, and also paying very regularly, an annuity during his life, in order to be released from a promise of marriage, he made that gentlewoman, of ten years standing, came from Protestants of unblemished character, Protestants of Mr. B——r's intimate acquaintance, to whose testimony Sir Henry thinks himself obliged to pay more regard, than to the unsupported assertions of a man, whom he can prove to have falsified a word of some consequence in a letter published, and sworn to by him in his affidavit, as will appear from the original now in Sir Henry's possession, and dated from *Hill-Street, Feb. 18th 1756*.

(n) See full conf. p. 42, 43.

that

that the subscription was not closed till above a year after (o)?

4. Is it possible to have any opinion of Mr. B——r's steady adherence to truth, who could tell a great prelate of our church that many passages written by Mr. *Salé*, favouring infidelity, in the folio edition of the *Universal History*, had been left out of the 8vo edition by B——r, who revised it, when nothing can be more certain than that no passages ever existed (p)?

5. Who can ever look upon B——r's word, as worthy of any credit, who remembers his strange and groundless accusation, of the compositor of Mr. *Richardson's* Printing-House, about interpolating his *History of the Popes*? And how little ought *he* to depend upon his own memory, or *we* upon his

(o) One would have thought so remarkable a detection could have admitted of no defence. And yet the Man in his reply, has the modesty to persist in his tale, with this small variation, that as it could not be *St Botolph's Church*, it must be *St Catherine Coleman*. He might as well have said any other Church.

At this rate we shall never confute him.——As to the difference between his account of the *Books of St Botolph*, and that which I gave, it is a matter of great indifference which of the accounts is most exact, since it hath been proved and admitted by himself, that the subscription was not full, till above a year after he said it was. However, I shall only observe that I had my information from a Gentleman of great veracity, who went with one of the principal parishioners to consult the Books, and any mistake they made in their search (if any mistake at all) could be owing only to hurry: there being no occasion to be very exact as to other particulars, when B——r's deceit was demonstrated, from the false account of the closing of the subscription

(p) See B——r and *Tillemont* compared, p. 62,

veracity

veracity, when he could be so unlucky as to complain, that his enemies had most unjustly charged him with having related such a story, to a Noble Lady of the highest rank, who well remembered to have heard him relate the very story, as true (q) ?

6. Can we bear with any patience, the insolence of this Man's fictions, who could deny that he was a *Priest*, in a family where he visited, and yet be so *indiscrete* as in that very family, to reveal the secrets which he had learnt in confession, the highest exercise of the *Priestly* function (r) ?

7. Has it not been proved, to a demonstration, that B——r's *History of the Popes*, is a most shameful and barefaced transcript from *Tillemont*, for several centuries, though the author solemnly disclaimed the assistance of moderns in his history of the ancient *Popes* ? What deceits, therefore, may we not well suppose such a Man capable of, in private life, who hath been convicted of so amazing an attempt to deceive the public (s) ?

(q) See six letters ill. p. 41, 42.

(r) Mr. B——r in some of his defences boasts that he has not *lost one friend*, since the controversy about his character: mark here another glaring falshood. He knows that he dare not shew his face at several houses where once he was honored with admittance, and I believe he has not ventured of late to visit the Gentleman and Lady, mentioned in this paragraph.—— See six letters ill. p. 42, and full conf. p. 87, 88, where B——r's miserable evasion that the *Lady must have misunderstood him, or he her*, is effectually confuted.

(s) See B——r and *Tillemont*, at large.

8. Have

8. Have we not a remarkable proof of Mr. B—r's being capable of saying any thing, that may serve his present purpose, when we see him asserting that a *considerable part of the Roman History* (t) was not his; an assertion contradicted by his own former acknowledgements, and by the evidence of persons who had all the means of information (u)?

9. Has not this Man readiness to assert whatever his imagination supposes may pass unconfuted, been fully exemplify'd in his affirming that *Martin Folkes Esq;* shewed him the *polype* and offered to lend him Books; as it hath been incontestably proved that this could not be true, from the stubborn evidence of dates (x)?

10. Was

(t) 1st. Part p. 40.

(u) See full conf. p. 50, 52.

(x) See full conf. p. 47, 49. B—r in his reply p. 48, aims at an answer to this charge only by a repetition of his falshood, and by giving us a new proof of his entire disregard to truth. It is a fact that Mr. *Folkes* did not shew the *polype* after 1742-3. B—r says it was shewn to him, after it was known that he intended to write a *History of the Popes*; for he says that Mr. *Folkes*, at that visit offered him the use of his Books, for that work. Now this I proved to be false, by what B—r himself tells us. For p. 20 of his 2d part, he reasons on the improbability of his corresponding with the *Jesuits* till the 25 of *March in the Year 1747, two days before he published his Proposals for the History of the Popes, and a Year after he had declared his having resolved to engage in that work.* These are B—r's own words, and they expressly mark out 1746 as the Year when he declared, not in public (for this was in 1747) but in private, that he had resolved to write a *History of the Popes*. This date unfortunately does not tally with what he had said about Mr. *Folkes's* offer of Books; and, therefore, without shame he confutes himself; by telling us in his reply, *that he mentioned to several Persons his intension of writing a History*

10. Was there ever a more remarkable instance, of insolent imposition than came to light by B—r's appeal to *Father Piazza's Book as giving an account of the story of the Country Curate that entirely agrees with what, he says, he read in the records of the inquisition at Macerata?* This was the only evidence that B—r hath ever offered to produce, in confirmation of his inquisition adventures, and from this very evidence we had a demonstration of their falshood. " For if light and darknes be the same, " if *Leoni, and Montecuccoli* be the same, if *Ancona* " and *Macerata* be the same, if torturing and not " torturing be the same, then, but not till then, " will Mr. B—r be able to extricate himself out " of this labyrinth " (y).

Lastly ; from these and many other *detections* of Mr. B——r may I not be allowed to draw this conclusion, that they who are satisfied with the unsupported affirmation of such a Man, in his own cause, and shut their Eyes to real

F 2

evi-

History of the Popes, long before the Year 1743. One would scarcely believe it possible to find a Man so obstinately persevering in a defence which serves only to give us fresh proofs of his prevarications.

(y) See Full Conf. p. 5, and 16. He has attempted to extricate himself out of this Labyrinth, in his reply p. 2. in a most wonderful manner, by telling us that he related the fact upon memory. My disagreement, says he, therefore, with *Piazza* does not impeach my veracity, but only my memory. It is very unfortunate, that Mr. B——r's memory should fail so totally in the relation of facts which he asserts with so great confidence ; so that it appears from this confession, that we cannot depend upon the truth of any one fact advanced by him. However this it seems will not destroy his credit. For tho' it should be proved that, in no one part of his tale, he deviates into truth some of his worthy friends will have this
satisfactory

evidence demonstrating his guilt, are either lamentably blinded by *prejudice*, or obstinately hardened against *conviction*? But such are the humbling scenes with which human nature presents us! For instances of *deplorable weakness* may be produced as well as instances of *detestable wickedness*: and if a *Fournier* and a *B——r* raise our indignation, it must command our sorrow to see them so artful as to impose upon merit.

C H A P. IX.

The detection of B——r's inquisition tale and Italian adventures, proposed as the design of the following sheets.

HAVING, in the foregoing Chapters, drawn into one point of view, the great variety of proofs demonstrative of the charge brought against *B——r*, and which lay scattered, in three long Pamphlets; I proceed now to the principal subject of the present sheets—to lay before the public several very important discoveries of the amazing extent of the fictions of our enterprizing *Jesuit*, which have lately come into my possession.

The original charge against him, was his correspondence with *Father Sheldon*, which controversy I look upon as entirely closed, I having established the genuineness of the letters, by producing the strongest possible proofs—and my antagonist having already exhausted all his magazine of sophistry, falshood and contradictions, in his fruitless attacks. But in the prosecution of the debate, Mr. *B——r's*

satisfactory apology to urge in his behalf his falshoods that they do not impeach his veracity but his memory.

account

account of the inquisition at *Macerata*, his office, and transactions there, the motives and the History of his escape (a tale which he had frequently related and which fortunately for him had been believed) having fallen under consideration, materials have, been furnished by Mr. B——r himself, for a new detection of his inventions which will, in the judgment of every reader, be still more decisive, than the detection of his secret transactions with the *Jesuits* since his coming to *England*. This is the point which I shall now take under consideration; and I have such evidence to lay before the public, to prove that B——r's *Italian* adventures are a *romance* dictated by a brain regardless of truth, as will give entire satisfaction, except to those who shall declare it to be their firm resolution to be more swayed by the unsupported, and inconsistent assertions of a Man convicted of a thousand *falsehoods*, than by incontrovertible *facts*, witnesses whose characters are *untainted*, and records that cannot lie.

The reluctance of this Man to commit to the press the *wonderful narrative* of his adventures, which it was so much his interest to propagate amongst *Protestants*, can be accounted for, only upon the supposition of a consciousness, that it could not bear public examination. A tale which never existed beyond the imagination of the relater, might be hazarded, in select companys of friends equally disposed to believe, as unable to contradict. But, there was reason to fear, that if it was publicly printed and dispersed, it might fall into hands able, and willing to trace the imposture. And in no other way, can we account for Mr. B——r's formal disavowal of the genuine tho' imperfect account of his escape as published by Mr. *Barron*; and for his insolent contempt

tempt of the public, by breaking a promise, solemnly made, which would have put into our hands an authentic narrative, many Years ago. But when the letters to *Sheldon*, and the many collateral evidences of his inventions were brought to light, last year, he could no longer decline the disagreeable task. His silence upon this occasion, would have been of itself, a confession of guilt; and, therefore, in his first defence he was forced to put his name to a narrative of his inquisition adventures, which, till now, could never be authentically confuted, because till now, they had never been publicly owned.

The very relation of this tale hath served to open the Eyes of the public. For besides the improbability of the facts, and the inconsistencies between what he used to relate in private, and what he now thought proper to publish to the World; it appeared that we had not a single evidence for the truth of this strange story, but the word of the relater; that he had not any one voucher to produce, nor even, had in his possession, a single stroke (z) of a Pen, that might induce *Protestants* to give the least credit to a narrative with which they have been, for so many Years, insolently amused.—Such a tale, related by such a Man, under the strongest temptations to deceive, could scarcely require a *formal confutation*. However, such a confutation, shall now be produced; and the falshood of *B—r's Italian* adventures shall be *demonstrated*, in so full, so unexceptionable a manner, as will satisfy him that I was not a false Prophet, when I said *that he would have reason to curse, in the bitterness of his heart, that Day on which he published an answer (a)* which hath served no purpose, but to enable us to trace him thro' the amazing extent of his fictions.

(z) See first part p. 47. (a) See Full Conf. p. 7.

CHAP.

C H A P. X.

Confirmation of Father Conyers's evidence.

IN the first pamphlet against *B—r*, intelligence fatal to his credibility, received by Sir *H—y B—d* in a letter from *Italy*, was laid before the public (*b*). In this letter, the substance of *B—r*'s tale, was contradicted by appealing to the evidence of three *Jesuits*, his cotemporaries and acquaintance, fathers *Lunardi*, *Alticozzi* and *Conyers*, which last person, by relating the circumstances of the escape, and asserting it to have been made from *Perugia*, and not from *Macereta*, appeared to be almost formidable witness—No wonder, therefore, that the authenticity of a letter containing such intelligence, should be attacked as it was, by the desperate *Jesuit*, who not satisfied with his evasive remarks on it, which I sufficiently exposed (*c*), ventures to offer another objection, which indeed would be decisive, if it could have been supported, saying, that *he very much questions whether Father Conyers*, the principal evidence appealed to, *be living* (*d*).

But, this suspicion is as groundless as it is base. For, I beg leave to inform the reader, that the letter containing Father *Conyers*'s testimony, bears date, *May 1, 1756*, and, as may proved from our news papers, was published, in the *Six Letters illustrated*, on the 29th of *June*, the same Year. Now that

(*b*) *Six Letters illust.* p. 85, 86, 87.

(*c*) See full Conf, p. 22, 23.

(*d*) First part p. 60.

Conyers was alive, above three months after the date of the letter, can be demonstrated; as I am able to mention, most authentically, the very day of his death. For a printed calender or register published at *Rome* for the year 1756, hath been procured and there I read, p. 57. under the article of *Vita Functi Anno 1756.*

P. Joannes Conyers, Prof. 4 Voto. Romæ 3 Julii.

I leave it to *B——r*, to cite witnesses for evidence they never gave, and to appeal to the dead for facts which he hath no other way to authenticate to the living. His adversaries, have too good a cause, to follow this example; and it would have been absurd to suspect them of making a fraudulent use of *Conyers's* name, even tho' they could not have produced such evidence of his being living when the letter was writ; because the same facts, for which *Conyers's* authority is cited, are so publicly known at *Rome* amongst the fathers of his order, that there is hardly a *Jesuit* to be met with there, who is not able to relate the exploits of *B——r* at *Macerata*, and the true cause of his hasty escape from *Perugia*. I speak this on the authority of Protestants of learning and candor, who have received this information about *B——r* at *Rome*, before the present controversy began. His friends if they had any inclination to satisfy themselves about this, could easily make the proper inquiries. And in the mean time, I shall present them, in the following chapter with the evidence of another *Jesuit* who now is, or at least was very lately, at *Rome*.

C H A P. XI.

*Detection of B——r, on the evidence of
Mr. Christopher Maire.*

SOON after Mr. *Barron* published the Narrative of B——r's escape (e), a gentleman now in London, who knew enough to suspect that it was a romance, had the curiosity to write for farther information, on this head to Father *Maire*, one of the principal *Jesuits* at Rome. The Father's answer, now lies before me, and from it I have made the following extract.

Honoured Sir,

——— “ I am at present joined in commission with another, to measure a degree of the meridian in this climate, and on that occasion to correct the maps of the country.—— For this reason your letter came to hand above six weeks later than it had done, if I had continued to reside in town. As for Mr. *Archibald Bower*, I am no stranger to his History, but cannot, in my present circumstances procure a certificate about him, such as you desire.—— That he fled from hence on account of a nun, perhaps of the *Buonacorsi* family is true; but whether any contrivance was used, or no, for her elopement, I know not.—— When he abandoned his first calling, he was no more than a master of philo-

(e) In November 1750.

G

“ sophy,

“ fophy, held in some esteem for his parts, but
 “ very little considered on any other account. He
 “ has since proved himself to be, what his coun-
 “ trymen call a false loon, by more than one con-
 “ vincing argument ; to which purpose I shall only
 “ mention this one thing, that while he had his
 “ history ready for the press, and perhaps had even
 “ consigned it into the Printer’s hands, he acted
 “ secretly with the superiors of the body he had
 “ left, to return to it again, merely in hopes of ex-
 “ torting from them on that account, some sum or
 “ other of money necessary for the maintenance of
 “ his family, which he pretended was numerous,
 “ how truly I cannot determine.—Thus you
 “ have the substance of his History, viz. That he
 “ deserted from *Perugia* for fear of the *Inquisition*—
 “ the cause of his apprehensions of the *Inquisition*
 “ was certainly an intrigue that had passed between
 “ him and that Lady, how far soever it was car-
 “ ried on. For my part, I never heard that he
 “ had concerted her escape.—I am with the ut-
 “ most sincerity, Honoured Sir,

“ *Your most obedient humble Servant,*

“ CHRISTOPHER MAIRE.”

April 7, 1751.

I shall leave this letter to the consideration of Mr. B——r’s adherents with a few short remarks.

First, then, as it was writ near five years before the letters to *Sheldon* were heard of, by Protestants, it seems to have very strong pretensions to credibility, it being sent from one friend to another, without any view of being made public.

Secondly,

Secondly, Father *Maire*, the writer of it, is a person of the highest reputation for learning, in *Italy*, and the effects of his labours mentioned in the beginning of this letter, made public at *Rome* in 1754, have done great honour to him and his colleague (*f*).

Thirdly, The air of candour which runs through the letter, and particularly when the writer, declares that he had never heard of *B——r's* concerting the Nun's escape, naturally inclines us to believe the other articles which he says *be is no stranger to*.

Fourthly, There is an exact agreement between this letter, and that of *May 1, 1756*, in which Fathers *Lunardi*, *Conyers*, and *Alticozzi* give their evidence; for, in both, we are told that he escaped from *Perugia* and not from *Macerata*, and that his apprehensions of the Inquisition, on account of an intrigue with a Nun, were the cause of his escape.

Fifthly, Mr. *Maire's* letter is a remarkable confirmation of the principal charge against *B——r*, his correspondence with *Father Sheldon*; for it appears that an imperfect account of that affair, had reached *Rome* as long ago as 1751. And it is worthy of our observation, that Mr. *Maire*, when he speaks of *B——r* acting secretly with

(*f*) The title of his book is *De literariâ, Expeditione per Pontificiam ditionem ad demittendos duos Meridiani gradus & corrigendam Mappam Geographicam jussu & auspiciis Benedicti 14 Pont. Max suscepta a P. P. Soc. Jesu Christi oporho Maire & Rogerio Josepho Boscowich.*—— See an account of this work in the *Critical Review* for *July 1756*.

the superiors, about *returning* (g), to it again, in hopes of extorting money from them, *necessary for the maintenance of his family* (in which account we trace the out lines of the contents of the seven letters, and the story, of the woman, her relations and the child,) represents all this, as a tale, the truth of which was very suspicious. He had not, it seems, any imagination that *false facts* could not come from the mouth of a deceiver.

Sixthly, If after all, our modest Historian, should have recourse to his standing topic, and urge that Father *Maire* is a *Jesuit*; besides putting him in mind of the unreasonableness of objecting to the only evidence, that from the nature of the thing can be had, I would desire him to remember that it is with the worst grace in the world that a *Jesuit* can object to the evidence of *Jesuits*; and, in particular, that Father *Maire*, a man of such established reputation, relating *B——r's* adventures in a private letter to a friend, many years before the present controversy began, is a witness to whom every sensible and unprejudiced Protestant will pay greater regard. than to the single and unsupported denial of Father *B——r* himself, a man convicted of a thousand immoralities in his *general* conduct, and unable to confute the many irrefragable proofs, by which this *particular* charge of corresponding with *Sheldon*, hath been supported.

(g) See *B——r's* evasive use of this equivocal word exposed, in p. 15.

C H A P. XII.

The attestation of Calabrini, vindicated and confirmed.

THE full confutation made its appearance so soon after *B—r* had put his name to a narrative of his *Italian* adventures (*b*), that a particular examination of facts, the scenes of which are at so great a distance, could not *then* be expected. However, tho' the *particulars* of the tale could not be confuted, before the event of inquiries upon the spot, was known, intelligence had already been received from *Italy*, by which the *Main Pillars* of the building were overturned. If *B—r* never was confultor of the Inquisition at *Macerata*, the whole of his tale, built on this single foundation, of course must be given up as fiction. And that he never was confultor of the Inquisition, was proved by a most solemn attestation, published in the *Full Confutation*. For what can be conceived more authentic, than an attestation signed by a *Notary*, confuting *B—r*'s claim, from the registers of the tribunal of which he had called himself a member?—But tho' the certificate of *Eusebio Antonio Calabrini*, carried such conviction with it, it was not to be expected that *B—r* who had the boldness to deny his own hand-writing, would have the modesty not a cavil at the attestation of another person. However, the manner in which he doth cavil at it, is a strong proof of the groundlessness of his Exceptions. He is called in it *Archibald Bower the*

(*b*) *B—r*'s pamphlet was published in *January*, and the *Full Conf.* about two months after.

Englishman; from from which he forms a charge, that *Calabrini* meant to equivocate (*i*), — *A—d B—r* being indeed a *Scotchman*. Perhaps his country will hardly thank him for putting in this claim to his proper epithet. But so pitiful an objection to the *Roman* Notary's certificate, will be treated with the utmost contempt, by every reader who knows how common it is for foreigners to appropriate the name of *Englishmen*, to the natives of any part of the *British* territories.

If Mr. *B—r* be an impostor, the possibility of which his best friend must allow, could there be a stronger proof of it produced, than this now before us—the attestation of a person in a public office, appealing to registers, and annexing the seal of authority (*k*). Nothing, therefore, seems necessary to induce us to pay entire credit to *Calabrinis* certifying that *B—r* never was *Consultor of the Inquisition*, than to have full assurance that such a person, vested with such an office, actually doth exist, and is publicly known as such at *Rome*. Now I am enabled to give every one this full assurance, by producing the printed *Roman Court Calender* for 1756, where I find, p. 70, under the article of *Consulta, della santa Romana & Universale Inquisizione*, the following description of our notary.

Capo Notaro.

Sig. Eusebio Antonio Calabrini.

(*i*) Reply p. 5.

(*k*) I have thought it would be right to republish this certificate; and the reader will find it faithfully given in *Appendix* No. II.

The

The unreasonableness of refusing to give credit to such a certificate as that of *Calabrini*, will be illustrated by relating a fact which is well known to many eminent Divines of the church of *England*, having happened within these 20 years. One *Black*, a popish priest, pretending to be a convert to our church, was countenanced by the late bishop of London, who made him a reader in the king's chapel. That great prelate was deceived. For *Black* was a most worthless fellow, and after running the circle of the basest immoralities, he escaped out of *England*, and appeared at *Rome* under the character of a divine of the church of *England*, and chaplain to his present Majesty, embracing popery. On this pretence, he was honoured and entertained by the Roman Cardinals as a valuable acquisition to their church, till at last, his real character, and story being known, he escaped out of *Italy* as precipitately as a certain *Jesuit* had done before. If I am not mistaken, the late *Martin Folkes*, Esq; who was then at *Rome*, by private letters which he received from *England*, satisfied the court of *Rome* that their convert was no *King's Chaplain*. But if the *Papists* would have been in the wrong, not to be satisfied with the evidence of a private letter, vastly more absurd, and ridiculous would they have been, if they had disregarded a formal confutation of the tale, by an authentic certificate from the lord chamberlain's office. How absurd therefore, and ridiculous is the attachment of *B—r's* adherents, who can still give credit to his assumed title of consultor of the Inquisition, tho' an authentic certificate is produced to prove the imposture? — But, says *B—r* (Reply 5.) why did the *Jesuits* and popish priests, suffer me for thirty Years together, to relate in all companys, the

the unheard of barbarities of the Inquisition, without applying for an authentic certificate to silence and confound me ? — Mark here the astonishing insolence of the man! Didst thou, then, in *all* companies relate the *unheard of barbarities* of the Inquisition? Hast thou forgot thy panegyrick on the impartiality of that tribunal, which so much surprized the *Noble Lord*, who had it from thy own mouth? Didst thou expatiate on these barbarities, at Mrs. *Hoyle's* whilst thou wast praising the *spiritual exercises* of the *Jesuits*, and vindicating the church of *Rome* from the *misrepresentations* of Protestants? Were these the topics of thy private conferences with Fathers *Carteret* and *B—k—r*? Didst thou entertain the circle of thy Catholic friends at the shop of Mr. *Lewis*, with such matters? How, therefore, canst thou have the effrontery to say that thy Inquisition tale, was related by thee, in *all* companies? No, Sir, it is charged upon thee, and it cannot be denied, that this tale was smuggled for thirty years, in select companies of believing friends, where neither Jesuit nor priest could hear, or confute, nor was it hazarded in public, till thou couldst not any longer avoid the fatal task. — I say, fatal; for the following detection could have never been effected, if thy own narrative had not furnished the means of inquiry. Nor could it have entered into the imagination of Sir *H—B—d*, or any Roman Catholic or Protestant in England, unacquainted with what was known of thee in *Italy*, to suppose that thou couldst have the boldness to call thyself a Consulter of the Inquisition, without having been really such, till thy wonderful behaviour in disowning thy letters to *Sheldan*, gave Sir *H—* sufficient room for suspecting thee capable of any falsehood, and occasioned his writing into *Italy*; by which means he has procured the *authentic certificate*

state of Calabrine which would have silenced and confounded any body but thyself, and many other authentic certificates, which, whatever effect they may have upon the few persons who still adhere to thee will demonstrate the amazing extent of thy impositions on this Protestant Nation.

C H A P. XIII.

Detection of B——r on the evidence of Prospero Ascenziarii, a Canon of Macerata.

THE first witness whom I shall call to confront B——r, is *Prospero Ascenziarii* who is now living at *Macerata*, and a person of some consequence there, being Canon of the Cathedral, in that City.—A Gentleman of *Italy*, who has resided a great many Years in *London*, and is known to *Protestants* of great distinction, was waited upon, soon after the publication of B——r's *Italian* adventures; and as he keeps up a constant correspondence with *Macerata*, about his private affairs, he frankly undertook to transmit the particulars of the story to that place; and to intreat his correspondent to make inquiry if B——r ever was consultor of the inquisition there, and if *Count Vincenzo della Torre* really suffered, as we are told in the bloody tale. This inquiry produced two answers from his correspondent *Ascenziarii*, the originals of which, with the post marks upon them, are now in the hands of *Sir Henry Bedingsfeld*, and which, so far as they relate to our affair, (for there is private business mentioned in both) I have faithfully published in the *Appendix* No. III; and shall faithfully translate from the *Italian* for the benefit of the *English* reader.

The first letter is dated, *Macerata* March, 19. 1757, In this, after telling his correspondent in *England*, that he must wait for the return of the *Vicar of the Holy Office*, who had gone to preach near *Rome*, before he could give him full satisfaction about his inquiry, he proceeds to speak so far as he knew, *himself*. And Mr. B—r's friends will find he knows too much; when they read the following express Confutation of the *capital facts*, which *Protestants* have seen, so confidently asserted.

“ Every thing that he has writ, both about
 “ Count *Vincenzo della Torre*, and also about his
 “ own having been consultor of the *Holy office*, is
 “ an utter falsehood (k). And if he had not gone
 “ off, he would have been laid hold of himself, by
 “ the *Holy Office*, for *black attempts*. Know that the
 “ *Jesuits* have never been able to thrust their Nose
 “ into the *Holy Office*, in this state; nor did *Vin-*
 “ *cenzo della Torre* ever exist under Heaven. I give
 “ you these few lines, that you may not think
 “ I neglect your commands.

“ And am Your most Obedient Servant.

“ P. ASCENZIARII.”

But *Ascenziarii* did not rest here, for in the following letter, he hath strengthened his own evidence by giving us that of the *Vicar* of the inquisition at *Macerata*, agreeably to his promise.

(l) The *Italian* expression in the original *arci falsissimo* has a strength not to equalled by any translation.

“ Sir

MACERATA April 30. 1757.

“ Sir,

“ No sooner was the *Father Vicar of the Holy Office* returned but I communicated to him your letter concerning the supposed false facts, printed by *Father B——r*, that unworthy apostate. He has assured me that the whole is a fiction, both with regard to his being consultor, and with regard to the story of *Vincenzo della Torre*. But as *the inquisition is not at this place, the register of the patentati, is not here*. He would, therefore, have written to the inquisitor of *Ancona* to send him the proofs; but the inquisitor hath answered him that he had already been made acquainted with all the base falsehoods asserted by *B——r*, and had sent authentic certificates concerning the whole, to *Rome*, to be forwarded to *London*, by the person who had applied to him about them. As these will have come to hand, before this, I need say no more about this subject.—Being always ready to serve you I sign myself, Sir,

“ *Your most Obedient Servant.*

PROSPERO ASCENZIARII.”

Well might Mr. *B——r* be so cautious, as not to hazard his *Italian* story beyond the narrow circles of his unsuspecting acquaintances, during so many Years; as we find that no sooner was he forced to publish it, than it's falsehood is demonstrated. *Ascenziarii*, as we shall learn by and by, is an old acquaintance of Mr. *B——r*'s, and whatever effect his testimony may have on the believers in the infallibility of an *Ex Jesuit*, I am confident that my readers, in general, will look upon it as giving a

mortal blow to his credibility, as the facts are of so *public* and *permanent* a Nature, that the very attempt to falsify them would be absurd; and every one who goes upon the spot, may satisfy himself whether they be true.

But tho' *private letters* from *Italy*, such as the two just produced, will be sufficient to determine the judgment of most inquirers, there is no occasion to build much upon them; because the same facts to which they bear testimony, are confirmed by the most authentic certificates from magistrates by attestations, of notaries, and by extracts from records. These, therefore, I shall lay before the public; with such remarks, as may be necessary for their explanation, and they will open a scene of bold fiction which will surprise even those who have the highest opinion of Mr. B——r's creative genius, and will give him an undoubted right to be looked upon as the most wonderful character, which this or perhaps any other age hath produced.

C H A P. XIV.

B——r detected by a certificate from the inquisitor General of Ancona.

THE reader will naturally expect to see *that* authentic confutation of B——r's account of the inquisition, which the inquisitor of *Ancona*, as *Ascenziarii*'s letter mentions, had sent to *Rome*. This certificate shall therefore, be put into his hands, in this Chapter, translated with fidelity, from the original *Latin*; which is to be met with in the Appendix, No. IV.

“ *Josep*

“ *Joseph Ignatius Zabberoni* of *Ravenna*, of the
 “ order of preachers, master of divinity, appointed
 “ by the *Holy Apostolical See*, *Inquisitor General*, against
 “ Heresy, in the Cities and Dioceces of *Ancona*,
 “ *Osimo*, *Jesi*, *Sinogaglia*, *Loretto*, *Macerata*, *Tolen-*
 “ *tino*, and in the other accustomed and annexed
 “ territories and places of the *March of Ancona*.

“ We hereby declare and solemnly attest in the first
 “ place, that the *Reverend Father in Christ*, *A—d*
 “ *B—r*, of the society of *Jesus*, a *Scotchman*,
 “ never did exercise the office of *Inquisitor*, or of
 “ *Qualificator*.

“ Secondly, we declare and attest as above, that
 “ the *Holy Inquisition* at *Macerata* is subject to our
 “ *General Inquisition of Ancona*; and that we and our
 “ predecessors have always deputed to that place, that
 “ is to *Macerata*, our *Vicar*. From whence it evi-
 “ dently appears, as above, that the aforesaid *A—d*
 “ *B—r*, the *Jesuit*, never was either *Inquisitor*, or
 “ *Qualificator*, at that place: and it is also certain,
 “ from what has been said, that our *General Inquisition*
 “ is at *Ancona*, and that at *Macerata* is subject to it.
 “ In witness whereof, we have subscribed this with
 “ our hand, and confirmed it by putting the seal of
 “ our *Holy Inquisition*. Given at our House of the
 “ *Holy, General Inquisition*, at *Ancona*.

“ April 1. 1757.

“ *Joseph Ignatius Zabberoni*, *Inquisitor General*
 “ of *Ancona*; with my own hand.”

Upon perusing the above certificate, I think I may
 well address myself to our worthy convert, in Prince
 Henry's words to *Falstaff* detected in his tale of the
 Men

Men in Buckram—*What trick? What device? What starting hole canst thou now find out, to hide thee from this open and aparent shame?—The Inquisitor General* unfortunately for thee is so exprefs and exact, in his description of thy person, and his attestation of the facts, as to leave thee no room for evasion, and puts it out of thy power to conceal, any longer, with all thy sophistry, that thou hast built the ground work of thy fortune, in *England*, on tales destitute of truth. This will appear to be the case, from the following remarks; and that the detection may be as authentic as possible, *B——r's* own words, from the Printed Narrative, shall, as I go along, be cited, and placed in one view, with the certificate confuting them.

1. The cavil made by *B——r* to the testimony of *Calabrimi*, can have no place here; for *Zabberoni* hath given him his proper Titles, and epithets. The *Reverend Father in Cbrist A—d B—r the Jesuit and Scotchman*, whose identity with *A--d B—r Esq;* will hardly be disputed, is here stript of his Office in the *inquisition*, by the solemn attestation of it's first magistrate, declaring that he never was *Inquisitor* nor *Qualificator*.

2. *B——r* says, *were the records of the inquisition at Macerata to be produced, and consulted, from them it would appear that he had exercised there the Office of consultor (m).*—*Ascenziarii's* second letter, mentions it as a known fact, that the register is kept, not at *Macerata*, but at *Ancona*, and consequently, in the possession of *Zabberoni*, now *Inquisitor general* of that place, who confutes *B——r* from the very records to which he appeals, and which may be inspected upon the spot, by any one whom Mr. *B---r's* *inquisitive* friends may employ.

(m) First part p. 62.

3. Tho'

3. Tho' *Zabberoni* substitutes the word *qualificator* for counsellor; Mr. *B—r* far from having any pretence for prevaricating on this account, knows too well that this term hath been substituted to prevent his prevarication. He tells us, himself, that he was a *counsellor divine*(*n*); and I refer him to *Limborch*, from whose history of the Inquisition he has transcribed every thing he asserts about that tribunal, and who tells us that the name of *qualificators* is appropriated to the counsellors, who are *divines* (*o*).

4. But the Inquisitor of *Ancona's* certificate, besides confuting *B—r's* tale, by a positive denial of his having ever exercised the office of counsellor of the Inquisition, gives us farther satisfaction, by demonstrating that this could not *possibly* be true.—Let us hear *B—r* tell his story. ' In *Italy* ' there is an Inquisitor in every bishopric, or a ' vicar of the Inquisition called also commissary ' of the Inquisition. For the jurisdiction of the In- ' quisitor extends over several bishoprics, he re- ' sides himself in the chief city, and has a vicar or ' commissary in each of the other cities. *Under the* ' *Inquisition of Macerata, are the following cities,* ' *Macerata, Tolentino, Jesi and Osimo,* the Inqui- ' sitor himself residing at *Macerata*, and his vicar's ' in the other cities (*p*).—When I published the

(*n*) First part, p. 45.

(*o*) Quoniam olim Inquisitores erant Fratres religiosi--- ideo ipsis mandatum est, ut advocent Peritos, hoc est, Theologos, Canonistas, & Legistas ut eos consulent---singulis sunt suæ partes---Theologi advocantur ut propositiones examinent, & earum explicant *qualitatem*----unde & illi *qualificatores* sunt dicti. *Limborch: Hist. Inq. L. II. C. iv. p. 112, 113.*

(*p*) First part, p. 18, 19.

full confutation; tho' I was then entirely unacquainted with the state of the Inquisition at *Macerata*, I was, however, enabled to detect (q) the falshood of the above account of it, as given by B——r, from the testimony of Father *Piazza*, who was vicar of the Inquisition at *Osimo*, and expressly tells us that he was under the jurisdiction of *Ancona*, and named by the Inquisitor of that Place. But *Zabberoni's* authentic certificate lays open the whole fraud. In the list of cities, which are mentioned in the preamble, as subject to the Inquisitor of *Ancona*, we meet with *Tolentino*, *Jesi*, *Osimo*, and *Macerata* itself. In the body of the certificate, the subjection of this latter place to the Inquisitor of *Ancona*, is positively affirmed; and the impossibility of B——r's ever having been counsellor at *Macerata*, is taken notice of. For if there be no Inquisitor residing at *Macerata*, and having jurisdiction over that and other cities, as B——r asserts, but only a Vicar or commissary deputed by the Inquisitor of *Ancona*, as is attested to be the truth, all that B——r hath ventured to assert, falls to the ground, and is detected in the most effectual manner. It is not only false, but it could not possibly be true.

5. Our *Veteran in hypocrisy* is fully sensible of the force of the above remark. For in order to evade *Piazza's* evidence about the subjection of *Osimo* to the Inquisition of *Ancona*, he hath asserted with his usual effrontery, that *when he was at Macerata, Osimo was subject to that Inquisition; and that such alterations of jurisdiction are frequently made* (r). Indeed there have been wonderful alterations of jurisdiction since Mr. B——r's time, for now *Macerata* itself,

(q) See Full Conf. from p. 5, to p. 18.

(r) Reply, p. 3.

has lost its *Lord Inquisitor(s)*; his stately palace starting into existence like *Milton's Pandæmonium* is become invisible, his twelve well-fallery'd counsellors cannot be found, and the traveller, who shall now visit *Macerata*, and meet only with a poor *Vicar*, sent from *Ancona*, will, no doubt, lament the ravages of time, in stripping the city famed for being the residence of the illustrious *B——r* of its glorious privileges; and will observe as great a change between the *Macerata* that now exists, and the *Macerata* which *B——r* lived in; as between *Rome* as it now is, the seminary of priests; and *Rome* as it once was, the mistress of the world.—Such have been the changes brought about, within the *long period* of thirty years! So hath *Macerata* fallen since the year 1726, when *Mr. B——r* left it! The wretched man hath apparently no other apology to make, but that the *Inquisitor* and *Inquisition* of *Macerata* are now abolished, tho' they subsisted when he was there. An evasion with which, no doubt, some of his protectors will be perfectly satisfied without requiring him to prove the improbable, and unsupported assertion. And if he is to be indulged, when detected of the most glaring falsehoods, not only in the modest plea of a *bad memory* (t), but also is to be permitted to change the whole fixed establishment of policy in the *Pope's* dominions, to transplant tribunals, to remove boundaries, and to contradict the most *public* and *notorious* facts, only because they demonstrate, the imposture of his wild romance; if I say any of *Mr. B——r's* wife adherents will admit the validity of so modest a defence, he will be much in the right to

(s) See the Lady's account taken from *B——r's* own mouth.

(t) See his Reply, p. 2.

give them another pamphlet to that effect. But is it possible, for a lover of truth, to bear with any patience, such ridiculous attempts to cover detected falshood? That *Macerata*, from being the seat of an Inquisitor, having jurisdiction over other cities, should, within the short space of thirty years, have lost all its privileges, I believe as much, as that *Colchester*, was the seat of the Bishop of this diocese when his present majesty came to the throne, but that *there has been an alteration of the jurisdiction*, since that time, subjecting *Colchester* to *London*. I have as great foundation for the latter assertion, as *B—r*, can have for the former, which is a fact of so public and remarkable a nature, that if it be true, it would be absurd to suppose that it could be concealed or contradicted. But that it is absolutely false, and that there has been no change in the state of the Inquisition at *Macerata*, since *B—r* was there, is positively attested by *Zabberoni*, who, in his certificate declares that *he and his predecessors, Inquisitors of Ancona have always deputed their Vicar to Macerata*. This single fact, overturns the whole fabric of *B——r's* Inquisition adventures, and it is a fact of such a nature, that the disbelievers of it, will be at a loss to assign a reason why they believe that there is such a place as the *Vatican at Rome*.

C H A P. XV.

Montecuculi no Inquisitor; and B——r's detected by another certificate from Ancona.

THOUGH the foregoing certificate of *Zabberoni*, by attesting that *Macerata* is one of the cities subject to the Inquisition of *Ancona*, and that there

there hath always been a *Vicar* deputed to it, from the *Inquisitors* of this capital of the province, demonstrates that *B---r's Inquisition* story is *false*, and which is more, that it could not possibly be *true*; yet as we have a Man to deal with, whom tho' it may be easy to confute, it is not easy to silence; in order to put it entirely out of his power to prevaricate, on this head, it hath been thought necessary to make farther inquiries into the real state of the *Inquisition* at *Macerata*, during the time that *B---r* was there; and the following certificate, confirming the foregoing by a detail of particulars, and by an express appeal to the *register*, will open new scenes of bold fiction, and amuse the reader with some curious specimens of Mr. *B---*'s entire disregard to truth.

Joseph Ignatius Zabberoni &c.---&c. Inquisitor General of Ancona, &c. &c. (u).

' To every one who shall see, read, and hear these
' presents, we give the most solemn assurance and at-
' testation, that the *Office* of the *Holy inquisition* in the
' City and Diocesis of *Macerata*, was subject to our general
' *Inquisition* of *Ancona*, not only so far back as the Year
' 1720, but hath been so from its very foundation, and been
' governed by a *Vicar* subject to us. And from the
' fifth Day of May, 1724, to the 20th Day of March
' 1731, the *Office* of *Vicar* of *Macerata*, was exer-
' cised, in subjection to our predecessors, by the
' Reverend Father, Reader, *PIUS ÆNEAS MON-*
' *TECUCULI*, as appears in the 42 Page of the
' register of the *Patentati*: In witness whereof &c.

(u) See his Titles at full length in the original certificate
Published in the *Appendix* No. 5.

Given

‘ Given at *Ancona* in the House of the *Inquisition* on
 ‘ the 17 Day of November, 1757, Signed.

‘ *Joseph Ignatius Zabberoni*, *Inquisitor General*.

‘ *Angelus Bonvini*, *Notary*, and *Chancellor Ge-*
 ‘ *neral of the Inquisition*.

Tho’ I have no great ambition to be admitted into the presence of the Worthy Gentleman whose fame I have been the instrument of extending, I must confess I should not be displeased to have an opportunity of observing his behaviour, upon his first hearing, of this piece of evidence. For I cannot frame to my imagination the least possibility of a subterfuge, from the decisive testimony of *Zabberoni*, repeated and made more pointed by descending to particulars, and strengthened by the additional attestation of the chancellor of the tribunal, appealing to records which exist.

1. *B---r* tells that he came to *Macerata* in 1722, and escaped from it, in April 1726. It remains then, to know what was the state of the *Inquisition*, at that City, during this time. *B---r* as we have already seen, tells us that it had an *Inquisitor*, exercising his jurisdiction over several Cities. Now as it is a certain fact that *Macerata*, at present, hath no such privileges, and that the *Officer* of the *Inquisition*, now residing there, is only a *Vicar* deputed from the *inquisitor* of *Ancona*, *B-----r* can have no evasion, but to say, that this change hath been introduced, since the Year 1726. But this retreat, which the first certificate of *Zabberoni*, rendered desperate, is absolutely taken from him by the second, for it expressly tells us, that not only before the Year 1720, but from the very foundation of the *Inquisition*, the Office at *Macerata* hath been subject to the *Inquisition* of *Ancona*, and governed by a *Vicar*, appointed by the *Inquisitor* of that place; and, particularly, that the
 very

very person whom B---r, exalts to be *Lord (o)* *Inquisitor of Macerata*, and by whom he says *he was chosen Counsellor, (p)* was actually the *Vicar of Macerata* deputed by the *Inquisitor of Ancona*, and subject to him.

2. But, secondly; tho' we could not have been able to prove so unexceptionably that there was no *Inquisitor at Macerata* while B---r was there, which single detection is decisive against the whole of his *Inquisition* tale; the certificate now under consideration is fatal to his veracity, by enabling us to prove that, whatever *Montecucoli's* office might be, he could not possibly choose B---r to be his Counsellor, which is one of the principal facts asserted by the worthy *Jesuit*.

' Were the records of the *Inquisition at Macerata* to be produced and consulted, says he, it would appear that *for the space of three Years*, I exercised there the office of Counsellor *(q)*. But this cannot be true: for we now learn from the records of the *Inquisition*, which have been produced and consulted, that *Father Montecucoli*, by whom B---r, expressly, says *he was chosen Counsellor (r)*, did not enter upon his office, till the 4 of May 1724; that is, not till less than *two Years*, before our Hero, by his own account, escaped out of *Italy (s)*. If, therefore, he exercised the office of Counsellor, *for the space of three Years*, he could not, possibly, be chosen by *Montecucoli*. One or other of these assertions must be false; and such

(o) See the Title of *Lordship*, given him; First part, p.

(p) Ibid, p. 46.

(q) Ibid, p. 62.

(r) Ibid, p. 46.

(s) He somewhere fixes *April 1726* for the time of his escape.

instances of fiction would *silence and confound* any body but *B——r*. But tho' he still met with adherents after having been so effectually convicted of an attempt to deceive the public, by asserting that *Father Piazza was Vicar to Montecuccoli (t)*, can it be possible that any body can believe that he himself was chosen counsellor by this *Montecuccoli*?----- A tale demonstrated to be false, by the stubborn evidence of dates, preserved in a public register, the very page of which is quoted, and which every traveller into *Italy* has it in his power to inspect.

3. Leaving Mr. *B——r* to clear up this unfortunate mistake, by the very satisfactory plea which he made when I detected him in falsifying *Piazza*, viz. that his *memory* and not his *veracity* is to be impeached, I shall now proceed to state another of his *bold fictions*, so striking in itself, and so demonstrably fixed upon him, as to make every other *detection* unnecessary, to satisfy any lover of truth, that Protestants have been most insolently deceived by this prodigy of a man.

Father Montecuccoli is a principal character in his romance, but tho' the foregoing remarks shew that this man's name hath been made use of, without the least regard to truth, *B——r*, if he has read the second certificate from *Ancona*, must be conscious that it hath enabled me, to *detect* him of adding *forgery* to his *fictions*, and to demonstrate that *Father Montecuccoli* did not write that *famous letter*, which hath been one of the main pillars, on which our bold adventurer, hath raised his fame and fortune in *England*.

(t) See full Conf. p. 5, 6, 7, 8.

“ I received, in *London*, a letter from Father *Montecuccoli*, Inquisitor at *Macerata*, about six months after my arrival in *England* (c), inviting me back, and promising me in his own name, and in that of the holy congregation entire forgiveness (d).—The letter here spoken of was delivered to me,—by one of the waiters of *Pons’s* coffee-house in *Cecil Court*, *St. Martin’s-Lane*, while I was dining there,—and I no sooner opened it than, seeing it subscribed *J. Montecuccoli*, I hastened down stairs, but the person who brought it, had already disappeared (e).”

So speaks Mr. B——r of this letter; a letter, which tho’ it would have been his obvious interest to preserve, as much as an officer preserves his commission, or a traveller his letter of credit, he owns *he cannot produce*. That he *formerly* had such a letter in his possession, and that he actually did receive it at *Pons’s* coffee-house, I make not the least doubt; but I make as little doubt, that it never came from the person whose name he makes it bear. The subscription *J. Montecuccoli*, which he unfortunately mentions, furnished me with the strongest suspicions against its being writ by an *Italian*; these suspicions I mentioned upon a former occasion (f), and, fortunately for Mr. B——r he did not hazard a reply. I say *fortunately*; because if he had called in any of his evasive sophistry to establish the authenticity of this letter, this would have served only to encrease his shame. For, since the arrival of this certificate from

(c) B——r’s first part, p. 48.

(d) Ibid. p. 47.

(e) Ibid. p. 49.

(f) See full Conf. from p. 11, to 13.

Ancona, now under consideration, what was before only criticism and conjecture, is converted into certainty, and conviction: and I will defy our *Jesuit*, tho' he call in all the chicane of every jesuitical casuist, to be able to convince the impartial public that a letter signed *J. Montecuccoli*, could be writ by a person whose name is *Pius Aeneas Montecuculi*.—I have heard of a forged subscription, so awkwardly executed, as to betray itself by the mistake of a letter, in a surname. But, I believe, never was there an instance, before *B——r* gave the example, of a forgery attempted with so much effrontery, that care was not even taken to know, before hand, what was really the name of the person, so basely made use of. No wonder that *B——r* should lay an inquisition scene at a place where there is no inquisitor, when he could be so ignorantly insolent, as to forge a letter without knowing the name of the person, who was to be supposed, the writer of it. But what may we not expect from one, who may suppose it possible to find his adherents, so extremely good-natured, as to overlook every failing in his character? They who have, upon former detections of his attempts to deceive, solved every difficulty by throwing the blame on his *indiscretion*, he may flatter himself perhaps, will charitably forgive, this additional *indiscretion*, which indeed was a most unlucky one, of subscribing *J. Montecuccoli* to a letter where *Pius Aeneas Montecuculi* should have been read, before it could be possible that, the said letter should come from *Italy*.

C H A P. XVI.

Reflections on the foregoing detection.

THOUGH I have taken so much pains to degrade our worthy *Jesuit* from his place of counsellor of the Inquisition at *Macerata*, an attempt in which I think I have succeeded, beyond the least reach of evasion, or contradiction, he ought rather to thank me for this, as for a favor, than to resent it as a disgrace. For while I strip him of a title to which he has as little claim as to his assumed appellation of *Esquire*, what he loses in honor he will, by this means, gain in character. If he would reason according to my plan, I should be looked upon as his best friend. His friend, for vindicating his character from the aspersions of a *scurrilous libeller* who had the assurance to assume his name, and to represent him as having been a judge, in a hellish tribunal for three years, concurring with his brother torturers, in all their inhuman cruelties, and infinitely more guilty than they; because acting contrary to his own conviction and conscience. He may now bid defiance to the Ghost of *Vincenzo della Torre*, and see his friend rise to his view, without crying out with Horror,

Shake not thy gorey locks at me,
Thou canst not say that I did it!

Nor am I his friend only in this sense. For he ought also to consider that having demonstrated the inquisition tale related by him, to be a fiction, I give him the fairest plea, to draw from this an excellent argument in favour of his own abilities. For if invention, as the critics tell us the be characteristic of ge-

nius, no body can dispute *B*——*r*'s being a genius of the first rank, who reflects that he has been enabled not only to eat and drink, but to fare sumptuously and to fill his purse, the *Beaumont* of the rich and the favorite of the fair, for almost thirty years, on the credit of a tale which, now appears to have been, not the dull, faithful narrative of an historian, adhering to *matter of fact*, but the bold fable of an *inventor*, unconfined within the narrow bounds of *truth* and *Probability*.

However, I much fear, he will see this obligation in a very different light, as by giving this favorable account of his abilities, it may be thought that I shall give the reader an unfavorable opinion of his *morals*; but, who can help it? *Morals I taught no where* (*a*), are his own words; but *morals I practised no where*, he might have said with equal truth; and he must thank himself, if his *veracity* and *honesty* cannot be defended, by one so willing as I am to do justice to his *invention* and *abilities*.

But, perhaps, the *abilities* requisite to propagate a tale, unconfined within the narrow limits of truth, may not be very eminent. Men are naturally disposed to give credit to a fellow creature solemnly relating facts, as having really happened, if they have no previous reason to suspect his *veracity*. And an artfull deceiver will frequently be able to impose upon those who never departing from *truth themselves*, have no suspicion that *others* can be capable of deliberate falshood. Besides, the impudence of an attempt is sometimes the very cause of its success; and nothing screens fiction from detection, so effec-

(*a*) Bower's first part, p. 62.

tually, as the art of the deceiver in telling a story with such circumstances as may seemingly put it into every body's power to make inquiries, but which, at the same time, will incline every body to believe, without making use of this power. For as we can scarcely suppose it possible that a man should deliberately furnish us with the means of detecting his imposture; when a fiction is related with circumstances which furnish the means of detection, it frequently, for this very reason is admitted as true. Tho' *B——r*, therefore, by laying the scene of his inquisition adventures at *Macerata*, where we have seen that they could not possibly happen, by converting the Vicar of that place into a *Lord Inquisitor*, and by making use of *Monticaculi's* name, before he knew what it really was, hath by such an ill-contrived tale, put it in every one's power to detect him, who should make the least inquiry, his attempt was not so unlikely to succeed, as, at first sight, one would imagine.——But let not the folly of an attempt ever be urged by any one as a reason why he should not be suspected as guilty of it. Human understanding is so flimsy a composition, that when once it abandons truth it can seldom adhere to probability, and with all its care and circumspection, it will be involved in labyrinths from which it cannot extricate itself without shame. Thus the infamous *Bernard Fournier* when once he had resolved to be guilty of the forgery of the *note*, was obliged to have recourse to his invention to piece together a tale that might explain the bishop's motives in giving it; but in framing of this tale, he hath run into such absurdities, and asserted such falsehoods, as have ruined that cause which they were meant to serve. One of

Fournier's

Fournier's fictions well deserves to be mentioned here as it bears the strongest resemblance to *B——r's*. From the deposition of his patron, Mr. *Chevallier*, it appears that *Fournier's* tale runs thus, ' that
 ' whilst he was curate in *Jersey* he was interrupted
 ' and disturbed by the rude and indecent behaviour
 ' of a young Woman, whilst he was performing
 ' divine service in the Church, for which he libelled her in the Dean's Court, and not being
 ' satisfied with the sentence there pronounced, he
 ' appealed therefrom to the Bishop of *Winchester's*
 ' consistorial court, for redress, and having met with
 ' great delays there he personally applied to the
 ' Bishop himself and expressed to him his dissatisfaction at the delays he met with in *his Court*,
 ' and that if he was not redressed, he would complain to the Arch Bishop himself (b)' And yet, nothing can be more certain, than that *Fournier* did not appeal to any consistorial court of the Bishop of *Winchester*; for his lordship assures us *that he has no consistorial court, to which any cause from the court in Jersey, can possibly be brought, or ever was brought* (c). Can we read this part of *Fournier's* story without instantly seeing its similitude to the fictions of *B——r*? And can we wonder at the assurance of the latter in erecting the tribunal of a Lord Inquisitor at *Maerata*, when we see the former so ill furnished with materials to deceive, as to make it a part of his tale, *that he appealed to a court, which never existed but in his own brain*? Nay, the fiction of *Fournier* was infinitely more unlikely to succeed than that of *B——r*. Every one, could satisfy himself whether or no the *Bishop of Winchester* has

(b) Bishop of Winchester's Letter, p. 40.

(c) Ibid p. 41.

such a court; whereas the distance of *Macerata* might encourage *B—r* to give full scope to his imagination in the framing of his romance.

What hath been offered in this chapter, will not be looked upon by the reader, as a misplaced interruption of my chain of evidence; as it will solve a difficulty which may occur to some, how it could be possible for a deceiver to be so unguarded as *B—r* is seen to be; and will prepare them to read, with less astonishment, instances of his inventions and fictions, perhaps more striking than those already displayed.

C H A P. XVII.

Detection of B—r, on the evidence of Mr. Cæsar Parifetti.

TH O' the unanswerable proofs already produced, by which we demonstrate that *B—r* never was, and never could be, *Counsellor* of the Inquisition at *Macerata*, overthrow the whole superstructure built on this foundation, and make it a matter of the utmost indifference, whether or no, such a person as *Vincenzo della Torre* ever existed; it will not be disagreeable to the reader to find his curiosity gratified, by laying before him, what particulars have been learnt concerning this hero of our *Jesuit's* romance.

The testimony of *Prospero Ascenziarii* a canon of *Macerata*, has already been produced, who expres-

fly

fly says, that *no such person as Vincenzo della Torre ever existed*. This testimony of a person of some consequence, in relation to a fact, which he, as an inhabitant of *Macerata*, could not but have access to know, would, of itself, be sufficient to convince any one who hath attended to the authentic confutations of the other parts of *B—r's* tale. For the foundation of the tale being removed, by demonstrating that he never was counsellor of the Inquisition, it requires little faith, to believe the positive assurance of a competent witness, such as *Ascenziarii*, absolutely denying the existence of a man, who, if he ever lived, or ever was in the Inquisition, could not be apprehended by father *B—r*, or tortured to death, by the lord Inquisitor *J. Montecuccoli*.---- But Mr. *B—r* will soon perceive, that this story of his friend the count will rise in judgment against him, in a more solemn manner, and that we shall be able to detect its falshood, by evidence as unexceptionable, as the effrontery of the relater is astonishing.

The first person whom I shall cite as a witness, is now in *London*; one who, by his account of himself, is well qualified to speak to the subject; and from whose mouth, the following particulars were taken, on the 19 Day of last *December*, in the presence of witnesses.

‘ *Cesare Parifetti* says that he is a native of *Macerata*, and is now five and forty Years of age. He knows very well the family of *Della Torre* at *Macerata*, where he saw, about two Years ago, Count
‘ *John*

* *John Louigi della Torre*, whose Father's name was
 * *Count Louigi*. This *Count Louigi* had a Brother named
 * *Thomas*, who settled at *Recanati*: but he never heard of
 * a *Count Vincenzo della Torre*; nor of any other *Count*
 * *della Torre*, being put into the *Inquisition at Macerata*,
 * and tortured there; and if any such thing had ever
 * happened he must have heard it, as he has lived
 * most of his time at *Macerata*, and having never
 * quitted that place and it's neighbourhood, till about
 * 15 Years ago. Farther, he says, that no such thing
 * possibly could happen, there being no punishment
 * inflicted by the *Inquisition at Macerata*, in which
 * place there is no *Inquisitor*, but only a *Vicar*; and,
 * particularly, he remembers *Father Montecuculi*, in
 * the station of *Vicar* there. Being at *Macerata*, in
 * *January 1755*, he saw the *Canonico Ascenziarii*,
 * and asking him about *B——r*, the *Canonico* said
 * he remembered him well, and that when he was a
 * School-Boy, at the *Jesuits College*, *B——r* was
 * one of the *Masters*, and had left *Macerata* for a
 * 'bad affair.'

* This evidence being so fatal to the veracity of our
 * Hero, it will be expected of me to say something
 * concerning him who gives it. And, therefore, it
 * may not be improper to refresh *Mr. B——r's*
 * memory, by putting him in mind of the person who,
 * in the shop of *Mr. Davis* the Bookseller, the corner
 * of *Sackville Street, Piccadilly*, about four or five Years
 * ago, was confronted with him, and, in the presence
 * of *Mr. Davis*, maintained to *B——r*, that the place
 * belonging to the *Inquisition at Macerata*, was no
 * more an *Inquisition* than the *Watch-House* over the
 * way (pointing to *St. James's Watch-House*) was
 * *Newgate*. *Pariseti* has a good character, is well
 * known to many Protestants, and whoever would hear
 * more of him, will receive Satisfaction from *Mr. Davis*,

new

who well remembers the confusion Mr. B—r was under when this conference happened.

But tho', *Parifetti's* character is unexceptionable, his evidence will carry much greater weight with any one who will but talk with him on the subject; and observe the naivety of his manner, and the wonder which he expresses, that he should be desired to give his evidence to disprove facts so notoriously false, and which he can scarcely believe any one could have the effrontery to affirm.

C H A P. XVIII.

Fictions concerning Vincenzo della Torre detected by the affidavit of Signor Constantini of Fermo.

‘C O U N T *Vincenzo della Torre*, says B—r, had lately married the Daughter of Signor *Constantini of Fermo*, a Lady no less famous for her good sense than beauty. With her family too I had contracted an intimate acquaintance, while professor of rhetoric at *Fermo*, and had often attended the Count during his courtship, from *Macerata* to *Fermo*, but 15 Miles distant (*d*).’ This Lady is a capital character in the romance. ‘The Lady awaking at the noise and seeing the Bed surrounded by armed Men, screamed out aloud—till one of *Shirri* provoked at the noise gave her a blow on the forehead, that made the blood run down her face, and she swooned away (*e*).’

(*d*) B—r's first part p. 5.

(*e*) Ibid. p. 9.

The *Constantini* family have reason to remember so remarkable a marriage as this. *A Lady no less famous for her good sense than beauty*, married, so unfortunately, only thirty Years ago, could not, certainly, be forgot; especially when we are told That as they had only been married six Months, the Inquisitor sent an order to the *Constantini* family at *Fermo*, to pay to the Holy Office, and without delay, what they owed to the late Count *Della Torre (f)*.

If *B*—r flattered himself that, at this distance, the family of *Constantini* at *Fermo*, could not possibly be brought to contradict him, he will find himself egregiously mistaken, when he has cast his Eye on the following attestation, the original of which is Printed in my Appendix No 6.

In the Name of God, Amen.

‘ To every one who shall see, read, or hear of this my letter, I give full and undoubted assurance, and attest in the most solemn manner, that after the greatest diligence in making inquiries in my family, I do not find that any one of the Ladies formerly descended from it, was ever married to Count *Vincenzo Della Torre* of *Macerata*: if such a marriage had been, I must have known it, either by the alliance which would have ensued upon it, or by other proofs. Farther, neither with the said Count *Vincenzo*, nor with any other of the Counts *Torre* of *Macerata*, was there ever, so far as I have been able to learn, any such marriage. In con-

Ibid. p. 17.

L

firmation

‘ firmation of which I have subscribed this certificate ;
 ‘ *Fermo*, this 16 Day of *April* 1757,

Cristiano Cap^o. Constantini.’

In order to establish the authenticity of a paper of such importance there is annexed to it the attestation of a notary public, to the following effect (g).

In the Name of God, Amen.

‘ I the underwritten notary public, of *Fermo*, do
 ‘ declare, by these presents, that the most illustrious
 ‘ and noble person, Captain *Cristianus Constantini*,
 ‘ Son of *John Augustin* (Major of the Militia of the
 ‘ two Provinces of the march, of good memory) pat-
 ‘ rician of the Papal State, of the noble and *only*
 ‘ patrician family of *Constantini* at *Fermo*, five and
 ‘ forty Years of age, and well known to me ; having
 ‘ come before me, did then, in my presence, ac-
 ‘ knowlege that the subscription made by him to the
 ‘ above certificate, was writ with his own hand, and
 ‘ declared that every thing contained and mentioned
 ‘ in it was true ; and also swore to it’s truth, on the
 ‘ holy scriptures. In confirmation of this, it being
 ‘ required of me, I have published and subscribed
 ‘ this at *Fermo* this 16 of *April* 1757, being the
 ‘ fifth Year of the indiction, and during the pon-
 ‘ tificat of *Benedict* the 14.’

Antonius Henricus Martelli.

Not. sup: dic: rog.’

That the evidence of the family of *Constantini* of *Fermo* might be transmitted to *England* with all the

(g) See the Original Latin, in the Appendix No. 6.
 necessary

necessary forms to warrant it's authenticity, besides the attestation of *Martelli*, before whom the affidavit was made, care has been taken, as may be seen in the Appendix, to corroborate his attestation, by the evidence of the Archbishop of *Fermo*, signed by his Vicar General and Chancellor, and sealed with the Archi-Episcopal Seal.

C H A P. XIX.

Vincenzo della Torre's evidence disproved, by the evidence of Sig^{ro}. Costa and Cotolloni, of cerata.

IF after the testimony of *Ascenziarii*, *Parisetti*, and *Sig. Costantini*, any of my readers should retain the least doubt of *B—r's* having given existence to a fiction of his own brain under the name of *Vincenzo della Torre*, they will receive full satisfaction as to the point, in the present Chapter.

The following is a translation of an *Italian letter*, (*b*) from a Gentleman at *Macerata* to his correspondent at *Rome*, who had desired him, in consequence of letters from *England*, to make inquiries about the reality of *Count Vincenzo's* existence.

(*b*) See the original *Italian* in Appendix No. 7.

Ma-

Macerata 31. May. 1757.

Sir,

‘ I have omitted, till now, giving you any news
 ‘ about the commission you employed me in, by
 ‘ your letter of the 22 of *March* last; because I
 ‘ was willing to cause the most exact researches
 ‘ be made, so far back as 1650, whether, from
 ‘ that time, any such person as Count *Vincenzo*
 ‘ *della Torre*, has lived at this place. All the
 ‘ searches have been in vain, which have been
 ‘ made both in the public Books of the City, as
 ‘ also in the archives. If you believe, that he
 ‘ might be descended from the family, which re-
 ‘ sides amongst us at present, I can attest the con-
 ‘ trary to you; because it is but a few Years since
 ‘ it came to this place, is originally from *Civita*
 ‘ *Nova*, and dwelt at *Monte Santo*. You must,
 ‘ therefore, let me know, if you will have the
 ‘ authentic proofs of this from the secretary of our
 ‘ City, or from any other person, which shall be
 ‘ immediately executed. I beg you will excuse my
 ‘ having delayed the execution of your commands
 ‘ till now; as this happened by my being great
 ‘ part of the time out of Town; and the person
 ‘ to whom I gave the commission did not acquaint
 ‘ me with the result of his inquiries till yesterday
 ‘ at *Monte dell’Olmo*, and I am upon the point of
 ‘ setting out for *Macerata*, where if I can be of
 ‘ any service to you, please to command me, as I
 ‘ assure you that I have the highest respect for all
 ‘ your family, and I beg my compliments to them
 ‘ and to all friends.’

Adieu, Yours &c.

CARLO COSTA.’

By inquiry from *Cesar Parisetti* the native of *Macerata*, now in *London*, I learn that Signr. *Costa* the writer of the above letter, is a person of consequence in *Macerata*, and brother to Sigr. *Benedetto Costa*, receiver or treasurer of the public money there, who has an estate at *Monte dell'Olmo* a little town near that city. There cannot, therefore, be a more unexceptionable witness, as the fact to which he speaks must be known to him, and to every inhabitant of *Macerata*. However, we shall not have occasion to rest it, on his private letter; for the non-existence of such a person as *Vincenzo della Torre*, is authenticated in the most solemn manner, by the following certificate, the original latin of which, with the representation of the notarie's seal, may be perused in the Appendix, N^o. VIII.

In the Name of God, Amen.

‘ I the underwritten notary, and secretary of
 ‘ the city of *Macerata*, do give the most solemn
 ‘ assurances and attestation, after making the
 ‘ most exact, and many repeated searches, in
 ‘ the public books of the most illustrious com-
 ‘ munity of the aforesaid city, that I have not
 ‘ found in any period of time, a Count *Vincenzo*
 ‘ *della Torre* described, enrolled, registered, nei-
 ‘ ther in the list of the most excellent *reformati*;
 ‘ nor in the most noble catalogue of the *creden-*
 ‘ *tarii*, nor in the noble assembly of *magistrates*,
 ‘ nor, in fine, in the number of the private ci-
 ‘ tizens of this aforesaid city. And this being
 ‘ the truth, in confirmation of the foregoing, I
 ‘ I have

‘ I have subscribed and published this, and put
 ‘ my seal to it, this 19th Day of July, 1757.

Andreas Coteloni of Monte Santo, Not. Publ.
 register’d in the Archives of the Roman-
 Court, and, at present secretary to the
 Corporation of *Macerata*.

Can it be possible, that any one should read
 the above attestations, without being perfectly
 satisfied that *Vincenzo della Torre*, no more existed
 any where out of *B—r*’s narrative, than a
 thousand *Popish* Saints have existed, any where
 out of the calender?

C H A P. XV.

B—r never professor of Rhetoric at Rome;
 proved from a certificate of the provincial of
 the Roman Province.

HA V I N G so conspicuously displayed
 Mr. *B—r*’s inventive faculty, with re-
 gard to the inquisition at *Macerata*, and his
 friend *Vincenzo della Torre*, I proceed to give a
 remarkable instance of the liberty he has taken
 to amuse Protestants at the expence of truth with
 accounts of employments of honour enjoyed by
 him while in *Italy*.

Let us hear what he says about the pompous
 title of professor of Rhetoric, in the university of
Rome.

Rome. ‘ In the last and fourth year of my study
 ‘ of divinity, that is in 1719, I was chosen to
 ‘ supply the room of Father *Flaminii*, professor
 ‘ of Rhetoric in the *Roman* college gone to take
 ‘ the country air at *Frescati*, for the recovery
 ‘ of his health-----Father *Flaminii* being upon
 ‘ the recovery of his health, employed in matters
 ‘ of a different nature, and sent upon some
 ‘ private affairs of the order, into *Saxony*. I
 ‘ was appointed as I had just then ended my course
 ‘ of divinity, professor of Rhetoric, in his room (i).’
 The following certificate (k) of *Ridolfi*, provin-
 cial of the *Roman* Province, under his seal of
 office, presents us with a full confutation to the
 above account.

‘ I the underwritten provincial of the society
 ‘ of *Jesus*, in the *Roman* province, do declare
 ‘ and testify, that *Archibald Bower*, a *Scotch-*
 ‘ *man*, was admitted into our Order, in this
 ‘ *Roman* province, on the 9th of *December* 1706;
 ‘ and in due time, was ordained priest, made so-
 ‘ lemn profession of our four vows, and remained
 ‘ with us about 20 years, till, at last in 1726,
 ‘ he departed out of *Italy* without taking leave.
 ‘ While he continued with us he studied philo-
 ‘ sophy and divinity, to good purpose; yet not
 ‘ so but that he had still, many of his fellow
 ‘ students equal, if not superior to him in abi-
 ‘ lities and learning. Both before and after he
 ‘ finished his studies, he was employed as
 ‘ the rest are, in the offices peculiar to our

(i) *B-----* first part, p. 66.

(k) See the latin original in the Appendix.

' society; but without any mark of distinction;
 ' which could be construed as if we acknow-
 ' leged any superior merit in him, above that
 ' of our other members. And, in particular,
 ' he never was appointed to teach rhetoric in
 ' the *Roman College*, unless perhaps for the short
 ' space of a few days, which frequently hap-
 ' pens, in the absence of the master. *Much less*
 ' *was he chosen successor to Father Francis Flamini*
 ' *on account of his journey to Saxony*, which jour-
 ' ney is altogether a fiction; as it never was,
 ' to the best of my knowlege, ever thought of.
 ' That every one may receive full assurance of
 ' the truth of all this, which hath been faithfully
 ' extracted from the catalogues and records, pre-
 ' served in the archives of this our *Roman Pro-*
 ' *vince*, I have set my hand and seal to this cer-
 ' tificate, Rome, in the Roman, college, the 8th
 ' day of *March* 1757.'

Hieron^{us}. Ridolfi S. J. Prepos.
 Prov^{lis}. Prov. Rom.

When the letter containing Father Conyers's
 evidence was published B——r could urge its
 being anonymous as a reason why no credit
 should be paid to it. He will, no doubt,
 change his method of defence here, and as Ri-
 dolfi's testimony is so well authenticated, he will
 cover himself behind his last entrenchment, that
 no Jesuit, not even the provincial of the *Roman*
Province, solemnly giving us his testimony is to
 be believed against him. But who is it that
 requires us to be thus incredulous?—An un-
 happy

happy man entangled with a variety of proofs of guilt, pleading his own desperate cause, and unable to bring any one witness to confirm, or to produce any one paper, to authenticate those tales with which he hath amused and deceived the inhabitants of *Great-Britain*. And what hath he done, to make him a worthy object of resentment, and expose him to be attacked by a conspiracy of this order?—Why he has imposed upon Protestants, a wretched compilation from Popish authors as an original history of a popes; a work which the *Jesuits* instead of endeavouring to suppress could not but wish to see continued and brought to conclusion, as their cause must be benefited by so unskilful an antagonist—If indeed he be not their secret friend. To those who are accustomed to ballance probabilities, with cool impartiality, there can be little occasion to ask whether we should believe the unsupported assertion of an *Ex-Jesuit* who has so many temptations to deceive us, or one of the principal members of the society, solemnly attesting a fact, which he can have no such temptation to falsify, with a candor that does him honor, and which, to crown his credibility, is confirmed, as he informs us, by *Records*, to whose decisive authority we shall appeal in the following chapter.

C H A P. XXI.

Detection of B-----r from the Registers of the Roman College.

THE evidence which I am now to produce is not that of men but of books; not the testimony of *Jesuits* whom some may suspect of concealing what is in their records, but of notaries public, unconnected with the *Jesuits*, solemnly attesting their having faithfully extracted, what these records contain——Records which unfortunately for Mr. B-----r, will demonstrate the amazing extent of his fictions.

The curious reader who would minutely examine the whole of the paper now under consideration, will find it faithfully published in the appendix No. x; here, I shall content myself with citing such parts of it, as are necessary to complete my detection.

It appears, then, from the solemn attestation of *Bernardinus Ciccomius*, a notary public at *Rome*; that he was, on the 24th day of *March 1757*, sent for, by the provincial of the *Roman Province*, in order to be employed in making certain extracts from the books and registers, in the archives of the *Roman College*. He declares, that all these books were put into his hands, and *that he extracted* and copied, word for word, the paragraphs put down in his paper, and after he had copied them, he faithfully col-

collated them, and found his extracts to agree perfectly with the originals. In testimony of which he sets his hand, and seal of office; and to corroborate his attestation, the certificates of two other *Notaries* are subjoined of *Placidus Gaudenzi*, and *Bernardinus de Montibus*.

Having thus fully established the authority of the extractor, let us now take into our consideration the extracts which he has made, and, from which, we shall be able to trace this uncommon man from his cradle, upwards, through all his migrations while in *Italy*, and to furnish biographers, who may be willing to preserve his exploits, with authentic materials to work upon.

1. In the 10th page of the book intituled *A Catalogue of the members of the Society of Jesus, of the Roman Province*; under the article of the Fathers who have professed the four vows, we read, *Father Archibald B—r, born in Scotland the 17th of January 1686; entered on the 9th of December 1706; professed on the 2d of February 1723.*

The reader, will find in the following part of this detection, the great importance of our knowing the year of this man's birth. Postponing the consideration of this at present, I shall present the reader with a falsification of *B—r*, with regard to the time of his admission into the order. His own words are *that he was admitted*
into

into the order, November 1705 (l). This date is confuted by the register—for we read above, that he was admitted into the order, on the 9th of December 1706. The certificate of the provincial also gives us the same date. So that, at first setting out, we find Mr. B——r modestly taking the liberty to make his admission a year earlier than it was, and, as we shall see by and by, fixing it to a time, when he was still at a great distance from *Rome*, a school-boy, at the *Scotch* college at Douai, in *Flanders*. If he should hope to evade this charge, by urging his useful plea, of a *bad memory*; what will follow will give us ample room for suspecting that he did not antedate his admission from defect of memory, but from a necessary precaution, and in order to enable him to give credibility, to one of the most remarkable parts of his Romance.

2. It is wonderful, that this man, in speaking of the most important Periods of his own life, should be guilty of such want of exactness. For speaking of *his making his last vows, or solemn profession*, he says, *this was done at Florence, in March 1722 (m)*; whereas the above extract from the register at *Rome* proves that it was on the 2d of February, 1723. The authenticity of which

(l) First part, p. 65.

(m) First Part, p. 72.

date, is confirmed by another extract. For in the year 1723, we find, under the title of the college at *Florence*, Father *A——d B——r*, then actually performing his probation. What his motives were for this second departure from truth, are best known to himself, I shall only observe, that as one falsehood renders another necessary, in order to place his taking his fourth vow, in 1722, he is obliged to vary from truth in another part of his story. For he tells us that he was sent in 1721 to *Arezzo*, where he taught philosophy *only six Months* and was ordered thence to *Florence*, where, he says, *his probation lasted from November 1721, to March 1722 (n)*. And yet, it appears from the registers of 1721 and of 1722, that he was during both those years teaching philosophy at *Arezzo*.

3. This man's account of himself being now brought to the test, it will appear what strange liberties he has taken to falsify and invent. For, as the certificate of *Ridolfi* assured us that he never was professor of Rhetoric, at *Rome*, we shall now confirm this from the registers. ‘ *In the fourth and last year of my study of divinity, that is, in 1719, I was chosen to supply the room of Father Flaminii, professor of Rhetoric in the Roman college, gone to take the country air, at Frescati.*—He being upon the recovery of his health employed in matters of a very different nature----I was appointed as I had just ended my course of divinity,

(n) Ibid p. 71, 72.

professor of Rhetoric, in his Room (o).---
 The whole of this account of our Jesuit's
 professorship, is demonstrated to be a fic-
 tion, by the following extract from the
 registers. For in the 14th catalogue, that
 for the year 1719, we find *Archibald Bower,*
mentioned as a student of divinity, and in the
3d year of his studies. And in the 15th
 catalogue, that for the year 1720, we find
him still a student, and in the fourth year of
his divinity studies; which date is confirmed
 by another register referred to by the notary
 public, in which, under the year 1720, we
 read the judgment of the four doctors, con-
 cerning the abilities of *those who have finish-*
ed their studies this year, and *A—d*
B—r, stands only the fourth in estimation
 for abilities.

What are we to judge of this remarkable va-
 riation between *B—r's* tale, and the re-
 gisters of his college? Will he have re-
 course to his bad *memory*? I cannot be so
 charitable as to admit the plea. For we see
now a most important reason, why Mr.
B—r's good *memory* should make a small
 stretch, and put down 1719, as the year
 when his studies ended, and consequently
 why he should make them begin in 1705,
 that is a year before the real time. He
 was necessarily obliged to find an interval
 between the conclusion of his studies, and
 his removal from *Rome*, that he might have
 it in his power to fix a time during which
 he might say he exercised his boasted profes-

(o) Ibid p. 66.

forship in the *Roman* college. For he was aware, that he could not possibly say that he was chosen professor, while he was still a student. As therefore, we find him, in the 16th catalogue, that for 1721, already sent from *Rome*, to the college at *Arezzo*, in which account he himself agrees, there could have been no time, for fixing himself in the professor's chair in the *Roman* college, unless he could make an opening for himself in the year 1720. For this reason, therefore, his imagination fertile in recourses, hit upon this very excusable expedient, to make the trifling falsification of one year, by asserting in opposition to what we now know to be the case, that his studies ended in 1719.

4. From this discovery so decisive against the reality of Mr B——r's *Roman* professorship, we can infer that another very important part of his history, hath no better foundation. 'As the Bull *Unigenitus*, says he, continued still to make a great noise in *France*, at this time, that is in 1720, I undertook, while professor of Rhetoric in the *Roman* College, to write an *Italian* History of the Popes (p).' This part of our Convert's true History, falls to the ground from his own account of it. He did not, he confesses, undertake the History till 1720, when he was *Professor of Rhetoric*, and we have shewn that in 1720, he was not professor of Rhetoric, but only student of divinity. And as it is admitted that he left *Rome*, in 1721, and never returned after, we can now affirm with certainty, what

(p) Ibid. p. 71, 72.

every

every one, before, might suspect as probable, that B——r did not begin his *History of the Popes*, or rather his translation from *Tillemont*, till excited by the hopes of a Protestant subscription; a more effectual inducement than the encouragement of Monfig. *Ruspoli*, Cardinal *Tanara*, and General *Tamburini*; names, which with a happy boldness, not uncommon to him, he ventures to make use of, to attest a fact, which we now see could not happen.

5. The most striking instances of this Man's wilful deviations from truth, as laid open by the registers preserved at *Rome*, come now under consideration, as we have brought him down to his removal to *Macerata*, the scene of all his wonders.

From the 17th Catalogue, according to *Ciconious's* extract, it appears that he left *Florence* in 1723, and was, during part of the same Year, Lector of Metaphysics, in the College at *Macerata*.

In the 18th Catalogue, being that for the Year 1724, we find him at *Macerata* still, thus described, *Father A——d B——r*, reader of *Physics*, in the fourth Year of *Philosophy*, Catechist of the Day Brothers, and Girls, Consultor.

Here then I cannot avoid remarking the singular modesty of the Man, who has never once revealed to Protestants his having been vested with the agreeable employment of instructing the fair nymphs of *Macerata*. And were I inclined to ask any favor of the honorable

norable Catechist, I think that by restoring this title to him, which is really his own, I have some right to be forgiven for having stripped him of titles, to which he could lay no claim, without indulging himself in fiction.

But, perhaps, he will have less obligation to me, for another favor, for pointing out the foundation of that title of *consultor*, which he has laid as the ground-work of his *very true History*. For, from the register just quoted, the whole secret of his consultorship, comes out. He was *consultor*, not to the Inquisition, but to the rector of his own College as a *Jesuit*.

In the course of this controversey my antagonist hath frequently exulted over my ignorance of the rules and constitutions of the venerable society of *Jesus*. An unpardonable crime, in a Protestant! But with all his sophistry, he cannot contradict me, when I mention, that in every College of *Jesuits*, the rector names two or three of his members, to be his *consultores*; with whom he consults about any affair of consequence, relating to the College. I owe this information to Sir *H. B.* who has put into my possession, while I write this, printed lists of two *Jesuits Colleges*, where the names of all the Fathers are marked down with their Collegiate offices, and the *Consultores*, stand amongst the rest.

This office *B* ——— held in the College of *Macerata*, as he had also held it before, in 1721,
N and

and 1722, at *Arezzo*, as appears from the registers of those Years. Mark, therefore, here the wonderful ingenuity and veracity of this Man; he converts his collegiate office, into another not belonging to his College which he never enjoyed; and as his being consultor to the Rector of his own College, gave him no scope for exercising his talent of invention, he *dubs* himself a consultor to the Inquisition, and having, at the same time, made some small emendations to truth, having erected a tribunal at *Macerata*, which never had one; having converted *Montecuculi* the Vicar from *Ancona*, into a *Lord Inquisitor*, and put *Vincenzo della Torre* into the inquisition who never existed out of it; can we have any reason to be angry with our ingenious contriver of adventures, if he conferred upon himself an office in a Court of his own erecting; and made himself an Actor in a Tragedy which none but himself could relate, because, till he related it, it was utterly unknown?

6. In the register for the year 1725, we find Mr. B—r *still teaching philosophy, and catechising the girls at Macerata, and continued as consultor, that year*, which brings us down to the important year 1726, illustrious by the escape of A——d B—r from *Italy*.—That this story, as related by himself to Protestants, could not be true, the very complexion of it, full of improbabilities and contradictions, declared. The positive testimony of Fathers *Conyers* and *Maire*, which I have produced, overturned the whole fable; for whereas B—r's first and principal assertion

is that he escaped from *Macerata*, directly having asked leave of *Montecuccoli* the inquisitor to go for eight days to *Loretto*; it hath been certified to us by the evidence of the above named witnesses that he deserted, tho' with different circumstances from those he relates, from *Perugia*. Tho' the evidence of these two witnesses ought in justice to weigh more than the unsupported assertion of a man pleading his own cause, I shall have no occasion to explain the reasonableness of this to *B—r's* believing friends, as we shall be able to trace him to *Perugia*, and there teaching in a Jesuits college, subsequent to the time of his leaving *Macerata*, from the authentic evidence of the registers which have already been so fatal to his credibility. In the 20th catalogue, examined by *Cicconius*, that for the year 1726, under the title of the college at *Perugia* p. 25, we find *Father Archibald Bower* reader of metaphysics, in the 6th year of his philosophy and proposer of the meditations to the lay brothers.—This single extract overthrows the whole history of the escape. We trace, from the certain light of registers every motion of this unhappy man, from 1706 to 1726. We find him change his residence from time to time; and such is the regularity of the politic body to which he belonged, that if he was in more colleges than one, in the same year, this is punctually recorded. We bring him to *Macerata* from *Florence* in 1723, we find him fixed at *Macerata* in 1724 and 1725; but, in the subsequent year, we find him no longer there, nor yet out of *Italy*; we read his
name

and 1722, at *Arezzo*, as appears from the registers of those Years. Mark, therefore, here the wonderful ingenuity and veracity of this Man; he converts his collegiate office, into another not belonging to his College which he never enjoyed; and as his being consultor to the Rector of his own College, gave him no scope for exercising his talent of invention, he *dubs* himself a consultor to the Inquisition, and having, at the same time, made some small emendations to truth, having erected a tribunal at *Macerata*, which never had one; having converted *Montecuculi* the Vicar from *Ancona*, into a *Lord Inquisitor*, and put *Vincenzo della Torre* into the inquisition who never existed out of it; can we have any reason to be angry with our ingenious contriver of adventures, if he conferred upon himself an office in a Court of his own erecting; and made himself an Actor in a Tragedy which none but himself could relate, because, till he related it, it was utterly unknown?

6. In the register for the year 1725, we find Mr. B—r still teaching philosophy, and catechising the girls at *Macerata*, and continued as consultor, that year, which brings us down to the important year 1726, illustrious by the escape of A——d B—r from *Italy*.—That this story, as related by himself to Protestants, could not be true, the very complexion of it, full of improbabilities and contradictions, declared. The positive testimony of Fathers *Conyers* and *Maire*, which I have produced, overturned the whole fable; for whereas B—r's first and principal assertion

is that he escaped from *Macerata*, directly having asked leave of *Montesuccoli* the inquisitor to go for eight days to *Loretto*; it hath been certified to us by the evidence of the above named witnesses that he deserted, tho' with different circumstances from those he relates, from *Perugia*. Tho' the evidence of these two witnesses ought in justice to weigh more than the unsupported assertion of a man pleading his own cause, I shall have no occasion to explain the reasonableness of this to *B—r's* believing friends, as we shall be able to trace him to *Perugia*, and there teaching in a Jesuits college, subsequent to the time of his leaving *Macerata*, from the authentic evidence of the registers which have already been so fatal to his credibility. In the 20th catalogue, examined by *Cieconius*, that for the year 1726, under the title of the college at *Perugia* p. 25, we find *Father Archibald Bower* reader of metaphysics, in the 6th year of his philosophy and proposer of the meditations to the lay brothers. — This single extract overthrows the whole history of the escape. We trace, from the certain light of registers every motion of this unhappy man, from 1706 to 1726. We find him change his residence from time to time; and such is the regularity of the politic body to which he belonged, that if he was in more colleges than one, in the same year, this is punctually recorded. We bring him to *Macerata* from *Florence* in 1723, we find him fixed at *Macerata* in 1724 and 1725; but, in the subsequent year, we find him no longer there, nor yet out of *Italy*; we read his
name

name in the list of the members at the college of *Perugia*, his last station. For in the 21st catalogue we find him, in the same year 1726, *marched off to another province.*

Was there no other evidence to disprove the whole narrative of *B——r's Italian* adventures, besides the extracts, mentioned in this chapter, these alone would have been fully sufficient. By them his boasted professorship at *Rome*, is detected to be a fiction, his consultorship at *Macerata*, is proved to be an office not connected with the inquisition; and by demonstrating that he was a member of the college of *Perugia* in 1726, the whole fabric of his true history sinks into *fable and romance* (*m*).

(*m*) Having traced Mr. *B——r* so closely, while he resided in *Italy*, the real circumstances of his journey from *Perugia* to *Calais*, are all that is wanting to complete a true history of his life.—Two pieces of intelligence which have been communicated to me, clear up part of it.---In a letter from one Mr. John Wilkinson, dated *Paris 28 August 1756*, I find the following paragraph, *F. Crookshanks* is the only one I could enquire of concerning Mr. *A——d B——r*, he is of opinion the Gentleman came through Germany in his habit; but is certain he borrowed *F. Strachan's* horse, on a pretended visit to *Lille*, but rid to *Calais* where he sold it.' In a letter from one Mr. W. Green, *Douai September 12. 1756*, I read as follows. 'The fact of *B——r's* running away with the horse belonging to the Scotch College, upon pretence of visiting one of his ancient professors then at *Lille*, is certain; nor is it less certain that he left *Douai* in his religious habit, and that neither horse nor habit were ever more heard of at *Douai*. 'Tis more over pretty certain that he never visited his old master at *Lille*, but made strait for *Calais*, where it is conjectured he sold the horse, in order to equip himself for England.'

C H A P.

C H A P. XXII.

Carteret's correspondence with B---r authenticated.

AS I intend in this performance to gratify the curiosity of the Public, how far Mr. B---r's fictions and inventions have reached, I shall beg leave not to close my evidence, already so much extended by the copiousness of the proofs, without adding one or two more *detections* of this wonderful man.

Whether from motives of prudence respecting the interests of their order, and their own safety, or from motives of favor respecting their strayed brother, his letters to *Carteret*, of whose existence we had the strongest assurance, have been denied. This refusal was mentioned in the *Full Confutation*, and hath furnished B---r with a pretence to exult, in his reply, as if no such letters ever existed, *challenging the Jesuits to produce them* (a). The wretched man, driven to lay hold of every twig to keep himself above water, is not aware, that by this challenge he defeats one of his boasted arguments against the genuineness of the letters to *Sheldon*. "Had I writ those letters, says he, "I should have taken care to prevent their having ever been shown to any living soul. I needed only to have prefixed to each letter the word *soli*, to you alone (b)." How, therefore, can he be so forgetful of his own assertions, as to urge that no such letters, at those to *Carteret*, ever existed, merely because they have not been produced? I need only suppose that they had the word, *soli*, writ upon them, and their

(a) Reply, p. 17.

(b) Second part, p. 18.

not being produced is fully accounted for. And I beg leave to add, that it is as probable that such secrecy should be enjoined when he corresponded with *Carteret* about his spiritual concerns, as it is impossible that such secrecy could be enjoined, when he corresponded with *Sheldon* about a money transaction, publicly known in the society.

Besides; this challenge to the *Jesuits* to produce those letters, is as safe as *Dimmock's* challenge at a coronation. If they produce them in a hand so like *B—r's*, that those who have most dealings with him are ready to swear to their full belief of the identity, then they are forgeries, then the cry will be, that the similitude of hands is no proof. If they do not produce them, then his unanswer'd challenge is to prove, lamely as we have seen from himself, that they have none to produce.

But though the letters which passed in this correspondence are not produced, that there was such a correspondence, appears, in the most conclusive manner, from a letter writ by *Carteret* to Mr. *Hoyles* (Mr. *B—r's* proselyte) and which any one, who has the curiosity, may see, it being put by Mrs. *Hoyles* into the hands of Sir *Henry Bedingsfeld*. This letter is dated July 27, 1741, and signed *Ph. Carteret*; and the following passage stands in it, to the confusion of Mr. *B—r*; *When you see Bowers, with my service to him, tell him I wonder he never answered my letter.*

That *Carteret* therefore did write to *B—r*, is certain, and that the latter did not treat such a correspondent with so much contempt as *never* to write to him, is extremely improbable. If he had treated him so contemptuously, this must necessarily have produced a coolness on the side of *Carteret*; the contrary of which

which is evident from another letter in the hands of the same person, writ to Mrs. *Hoyles*, from *Flanders*, by *Carteret*, at least four years (c) after the former letter. In this letter we read,

I desire my kind service to Mr. Bowers, Hill, &c. as if named. Had B—r treated his brother *Carteret* so impolitely as *never* to answer his letters, we should not have seen him placed in this honourable station, the first mentioned of the intimates, and associated, in kind services with Father *Hill*, and the rest of the venerable mission in *England*.

However, it will be of little service to B—r, to urge, that this is no direct proof of his having ever writ to *Carteret*. For I must now put him in mind of something which I could wish not to have had in my power to mention.—In his second affidavit, *that made before Justice Fielding*, we find him solemnly denying, *That he ever wrote to, or received from, Mr. Carteret, —any letter or letters whatsoever.* Words which I shudder to repeat, when I look to *Carteret's* letter to Mr. *Hoyles*; and which Mr. B—r himself would have cause to repent as the most fatal words he ever used, had this been the first time of his making an affidavit. But I forbear all reflections on this matter, for several reasons.—No severity of expression can excite greater indignation, than the bare recital of the fact.—I would, if possible, draw a veil over a transaction, one instance of which is too much for the honour of human nature, and frequent instances of which would be too much for the safety of civil society.—And lastly, I should ill comply with my obligations as a christian, if I said any thing which might be construed into indecent insult, when, God is

(c) The post-mark shews it is a foreign letter, and *Carteret* did not leave *England* before the summer 1745.

my witness, my heart feels no emotion but of pity, and entertains no wish but for the reformation of an unhappy fellow-creature.

C H A P. XXXIII.

Detection of B—r about the time of his first leaving Scotland.

WHO ever heard of *A—d B—r*, and his account of himself, without hearing, at the same time, that he pretended to have been carried abroad into *Italy*, when he was an infant? They who still adhere to him must have heard this from his own mouth. But, as I have no reason to expect any openness upon this occasion from that quarter, so there is no occasion to appeal to persons who may perhaps have forgot this part of their favorite's tale. For that he did represent himself as one carried abroad when an infant, is well remembered by many gentlemen; and *B—r* will not have the boldness to deny it, when he reads the following paragraph, copied from a letter of the present bishop of *W—d*, writ to a friend in *England*.
 “The last time I was in *England*, which was about
 “seven or eight years ago. Mr. *A—d B—rs* told me,
 “that when he was an infant, I think he mentioned
 “four (*d*) years of age, he was sent for from *Scotland*
 “into *Italy* by an uncle of his who had a small go-
 “vernment in that country, which was given him by
 “the Grand Duke of *Tuscany*, to whom he had been
 “recommended by King *James*.”

Out of *B—r*'s own mouth, without producing any proofs, may be drawn a complete detection of this

(*d*) Many remember his saying two years of age.

part

part of his tale ! for the *Shibboleth* of the north-east coast of *Scotland* betrays him, and is a demonstration that he could speak his native tongue before he learnt *Italian*. He had not attended to this when his romance was first framed, and when he used to tell, in the circles of listening females, that when he was at *Calais* in 1726, he did not even know the sound of the *English* language, when he overheard Lord *Baltimore* and his company conversing in it. But *B—r's* history of himself during the early part of his life, can now be confuted by positive and satisfactory testimony.

William Menzies Esq; of Pitfoddels, in Aberdeen shire, a gentleman of rank and fortune, and universally respected by his neighbours, hath given leave to have his name mentioned on this occasion. Mr. *B—r* will be very sorry to find this gentleman still alive, as the following particulars, attested by him, will not bear to be compared with the account given to the Bishop of *W--d*, and which was a constant part of Mr. *B—r's* tale.

Mr. *Menzies* declares, " That he was Twelve years
 " of age when he went abroad, and was at *Douai*, in
 " September 1702, when *B—r* arrived at that place
 " from *Scotland*; at which time he seemed, by his
 " looks, to every one who saw him, to be at least two
 " years older than Mr. *Menzies*; who farther attests,
 " that *B—r* studied some years there, at the *Scotch*
 " college, to the end of his first year of philosophy,
 " when he was sent to *Rome* about September 1706,
 " as near as Mr. *Menzies* remembers, who himself
 " left *Douai* about March 1707." —In confirmation
 of this evidence, two letters, one from *Aberdeen*
 of the 19th of August, and the other from *Pitfoddels*
 of the 17th of October last signed by Mr. *Menzies*,
 are in my possession.

And

And now the use which may be made of the date of *B—r*'s age, in the *Roman* register, is obvious. Mr. *Menzies*, who could judge only by the looks, guessed him to be at least Fourteen when he came to *Douai* in September 1702; but, as we now know authentically, that he was born on the 17th of January 1686, it appears that *B—r* was almost Sixteen years of age complete before he left *Scotland*. And yet this is the person who says he was carried abroad when an infant, and who did not know the very sound of his native tongue before his arrival in *England* in 1726, tho' his native tongue must have been spoke by him till he was near Twenty years of age, about which time he removed from his countrymen at *Douai* (e).

Though I despair of convincing those who have resisted hitherto the accumulated proofs of this man's guilt, I cannot avoid begging their permission to apply myself to them on this occasion. I would ask, therefore, those who still honour him with their protection, whether they have not heard the story of his being carried into *Italy*, when he was an infant, from his own mouth? If then they find themselves grossly deceived in this instance, ought not this to open their eyes? What reason have they to suppose that other parts of the story, with which they have been amused, have a better foundation? In the instance now before us, inquiries can be made with the greatest ease. Let me intreat, therefore, those who apply any part of this address to themselves, to satisfy the world that their opinions are guided by evidence, not over-ruled by prejudice; and by writing to this

(e) Mr. *Menzies*'s mentioning that *B—r* did not go to *Italy* till September 1706, confirms a detection already made by the register which places *B—r*'s admission into the order in December 1706, which *B—r* had plac'd in November 1705, a year before he left *Douai*.

gentleman,

gentleman, Mr. *Menzies*, or by directing their friends who may have connexions in *Scotland* to write to him, in order to be informed of the truth of the particulars now asserted on his evidence, to put an end to the censures of those who pretend to find, in their conduct, no inclination to come at the truth, but a resolution to support *B—r* in defiance of demonstration (*f*).

CHAP. XXIV.

The evidence summed up ; and reflexions upon it.

HAVING now gone through the evidence which I proposed laying before the public, a short abstract of it will not be improper, to give the reader a settled conviction of its force and conclusiveness.

First, then, *B—r* asserts, that there is an inquisitor at *Macerata*, extending his jurisdiction over that and other cities.

We have shewn, that there neither now is, nor never was, such an inquisitor, and that the officer of the inquisition who resides at *Macerata* is a vicar deputed from *Ancona*.

(*f*) In confirmation of the evidence of Mr. *Menzies* about the time when *B—r* went into *Italy*, I here appeal to the testimony of Sir *Austin Goddard*, now at *Dublin*, who has declared to Sir *H. Bedingsfeld*, that he was at *Rome* when *B—r* came there, who seemed then to be at least Eighteen years of age, and could not speak a word of Italian. If any gentleman has the curiosity to have this under Sir *Austin Goddard's* own hand, a letter will find him at *Dublin*; and they may so learn from him the manner of *B—r's* escape from *Perugia*, as he had it from Father *Cmyers's* own mouth.

2. *B—r*

2. B—r says; that Father *Montecuccoli* was Inquisitor, chose him Consultor, and wrote him a letter signed J. *Montecuccoli*, pressing him to return.

It hath been proved from registers that *Montecuculi* was only Vicar, and not Inquisitor, and that his name was Pius *Æneas Montecuculi*. The consultorship of B—r is disproved also, by the certificates of *Zabberoni* and *Calabrini*.

3. B—r tells us, that *Vincenzo della Torre* was married to the daughter of Signior *Constantini* of *Fermo*.

Signior *Constantini*, the head of that family, attests upon oath, that no such marriage ever was.

4. B—r relates a tragical story of the death of this *Vincenzo della Torre*.

It is proved, by the private letters of *Ascenziarii* and *Costa* two gentlemen of *Macerata*, by the evidence of *Cesar Parisetti* a native of that place, and by the express certificate of *Cotoloni* Secretary to that city, that *Vincenzo della Torre* never did exist.

5. B—r calls himself Professor of Rhetoric at *Rome*.

A solemn attestation of the *Roman* Provincial contradicts this, and the registers of the college prove that it could not be true.

6. B—r pretends, that he made his escape from *Macerata*.

His

His escape from *Perugia* is attested by several witnesses, and confirmed by the registers.

7. *B——r*, not content with swearing that he never corresponded with *Shelden*, swears also that he never received any letter from *Carteret*.

Carteret's own evidence, in the letter to Mr. *Hoyle*s must give an answer here.

8. *B——r* pretends to have been carried abroad into *Italy* when an infant.

Mr. *Menzies* detects this imposition, and Sir *Austin Goddard's* evidence corroborates Mr. *Menzies*.

In a word, almost every single circumstance which this man hath related concerning himself, as the means of being countenanced by the inhabitants of *Great Britain*, is demonstrated to be fiction, by every proof that the nature of the case will admit of; and by a chain of evidence which is impenetrable.

And yet the insolent man hath so contemptible an opinion of the understanding of Protestants, as to suppose the possibility of the public's paying no regard to this evidence, and to hope that his own single and unsupported Word will set aside the strongest proofs which may be produced against him. I have frequently, in the course of this controversy, exposed the vanity and weakness of such a plea. But as it is the only one which my desperate enemy can urge, I hope the reader will excuse my offering once more a few reflexions upon it.

The pretence that no *Papish* evidence is to be admitted against Mr. *B——r* has its whole foundation
P in

in his own boasts of his importance ; a description of himself, which can scarcely be treated seriously. The Historian of the *Popes* was always a contemptible object, even before the real merits of his History were so fully displayed ; and as the calling in the machinery of the Gods, upon trifling occasions, is absurd in the poets, the having recourse to fraud and forgery, where the object is contemptible, would be equally absurd in Papists. But the unreasonableness of objecting to the attestations now first published is vastly encreased, when we consider, that before any of the *Italian* witnesses were applied to, to give their evidence in this cause, *B——r* had been already disarmed of the only weapon which the Papists could be supposed desirous of wresting from him, by the most remarkable detection of his ignorance and insolence, in passing upon this nation a miserable compilation from the Popish *Tillemont* as an original History of the Popes. The Plagiary of *Tillemont* most certainly was not worthy of further attention, if he had been a formidable enemy before. That detection effectually ruined his book, and the ruin of his book he would have us believe to be the the view of the Papists in conspiring to ruin his Character.

Let us admit, however, that *B——r* was really an object worthy of the resentment of papists ; the nature of the evidence produced against him is inconsistent with the suspicion of there being any forgery in the case. I can easily conceive, that had they resolved to ruin his character, they might possibly have attempted to forge letters against him (letters which would have been of a very different cast from those which I have proved to be genuine) ; because a forgery of this kind does not betray the immediate contrivers

contrivers of it to shame and discovery. And of this nature have been those impudent attempts made by the *Romish* church to advance its system of worldly power and grandeur, so many instances of which we meet with in Ecclesiastical History—*Forged decretals* of Popes, *interpolations* of Fathers, *corrupted* acts of Councils, and *spurious* donations of Emperors; which frauds, from the very nature of them suppose that the immediate tools made use of to execute them, were concealed. But who ever heard of a system of forgery so contrived by the Papists, that, in order to its being carried on, a vast number of witnesses should consent to be exposed to all the world as the contrivers of it? That men of rank and fortune, ecclesiasticks and laymen, private gentlemen and public officers, magistrates, persons in eminent stations, notaries public, &c. should all be prevailed upon to hazard their wordly credit (admitting that their conscience might be satisfied) by giving their names, their seals, their oaths to support falshood? To suppose that the *Jesuits*, or any other set of priests, could have such an influence over such persons as to make them consent to be so publicly marked out as lying witnesses, even in matters of the highest consequence to their church, is to suppose these *Jesuits* vested with a miraculous power of new framing the human heart, and of rooting out that principle of honour, and desire of reputation which men of every religious persuasion must covet, and which not even Popery itself can stifle. And shall we be so absurd as to suppose that what could not be obtained, even to establish the most important interests of *Popery*, could be obtained to expose a wretched *Ex-Jesuit*, from whom the interests of Popery never could suffer? But, farther, Mr. B——r's fictions are detected on the evidence of Persons unconnected and unacquainted with each

other; persons who could not possibly confer together to form a conspiracy, and separated through different provinces in *Italy*, distant as *Scotland* and *Ireland*; circumstances, which exclude the very possibility of a combination to deceive.

Add to this, that the very nature of the facts attested, is such as shews that they have their foundation in truth. Mr. B——r has unfortunately asserted facts so publicly known to be false, that every one who goes upon the spot may see this with his own eyes. It cannot be concealed that there is no Inquisitor at *Macerata*, that *Ancona* sends its *Vicar* to that place; and that this is not only the case at present, but was also the case thirty years ago, every inhabitant of that part of *Italy* will be able to testify. And yet, if this be testify'd, the whole of B——r's account of himself must fall to the ground. Besides, the certainty of B——r's fictions is demonstrated from the permanent monuments of authentick records, lodged in public offices, and which, as they have been already searched and inspected, every traveller who goes into *Italy* may desire to look into, and need fear no refusal. The records of the *Roman* Inquisition, those of the Tribunal at *Ancona*, the public books of the city of *Macerata*, and the many registers preserved in the Archives of the *Roman* College, are witnesses which will hang like a millstone about B——r's neck till he sinks never to rise again. To suppose that these registers have been falsified, is a suspicion which cannot enter into any body's imagination; for the thing could not be done without such rasures, alterations, and difference of writing, as would betray itself to every eye, and ruin that very cause which it meant to serve.—Wretched was the condition of the shameless defenders of the *Nag's Head Consecration*, when they could no other-
wise

wise give the least credibility to that impudent fiction, but by charging falsification upon the register at *Lambeth* (g). And *B——r*'s case must be as desperate, if he can so much as insinuate such a charge against the registers which *deteſt* his falſhoods, and the extracts from which have been made with ſo much ſolemnity, and confirmed by the attestation of three *Notaries*. Rather than expoſe himſelf by an attempt of this kind, I would adviſe him roundly to aſſert, that no ſuch extracts ever came from *Italy*, and, in plain terms, to charge me with having forged all thoſe certificates and attestations which bear witneſs to his infamy. And when once he begins this plan of defence, I would have him puſh it to its utmoſt extent, deny the exiſtence of *Mrs. Hoyleſ*, of *Mr. Horne*, of *William Sheldoſ* Eſq; of *Sir Henry Bedingfield*, of *Father Sheldoſ*, in ſhort of every witneſs that I have produced againſt him; and by an affidavit ſtamp authenticity on the bold attempt.

I ſhall only add, that if the attestations which have been appealed to in this pamphlet be not ſufficient to draw aſide the veil which hath hitherto been thrown over *Mr. B——r*'s Character, it will be impoſſible ever to detect fraud and falſhood. For if every deſerter from *Rome* is to be received with open arms, and without examining his pretenſions to credibility; if the aſſuming the venerable, but much abuſed name of *Convert*, is to entitle him to be protected, and his own unsupported account of himſelf, however improbable, is to be believed, in oppoſition to the full-eſt evidence that can poſſibly be produced—if, I ſay, this ſhould ever be the caſe, I would deſire every ſerious and ſincere Proteſtant to reflect how miſchievous would be the conſequence. For beſides that ſuch a conduct would expoſe us to the ridicule
and

(g) See *Maſon*, *Bramball*, *Willams*, *Courayer*, &c.

and contempt of *Papists*, and give them a pretence for charging us with that credulity which we so justly object to them: we should be exposed to the daily attempts of the profligate *Ex-Jesuit* and the abandon'd *Monk*; we should have our altars disgraced by the intrusion of other *Fourniers*, and the safety of society endangered by admitting into our bosom a swarm of vipers, who will put on all shapes, and assume all characters, if their assuming such Characters, without farther proof, be a sufficient reason for our admitting the pretension,

C H A P. XXV.

Proofs that Papists put on the disguise of Protestants.

I am naturally led by the conclusion of the foregoing chapter, to treat of a point which well deserves the serious attention of Protestants, and the discussion of which will shew that our pretended champion against *Popery* hath not been more forward in falsifying facts relating to himself, than in misrepresenting practices of the *Papists*, in order to make them appear less dangerous to Protestants.

In my *Full Confutation* I had mentioned what no sincere friend of the Reformation ever doubted—*That the Emissaries of the Church of Rome have been allowed to put on the disguise of Protestantism, nay even, that they may strike a more effectual Blow, to assume the Character of Protestant Teachers (b).*—I could scarce believe my eyes when I read in B——r's Reply the following bold contradiction of this Charge. “This I have often heard, but I know it
“to be false. The Pope himself cannot dispense
“with a Papist's wearing the disguise of Protestant-
“tism, or assuming the character of a Protestant
“teacher

“ teacher or writer (i).” And in confirmation of this unexpected assertion, he appeals for the truth of it to the “divines of the *Romish* church, and to every “Papist, priest or layman, throughout the world”(i). The regard which I have for truth, and my honest zeal to serve the religion I profess, obliges me to make some remarks on an assertion so visibly calculated to favor Popery, and an assertion which every Protestant (except B——r’s Protestant adherents) will think comes with a very bad grace from the mouth of a man, who is, at the very instant he makes it actually defending the suspected sincerity of his own conversion.

He is pleased to treat with the utmost contempt two instances of *disguised* Papists, *Thomas Heath* and *Faithful Commin*, the detection of whom I quoted from *Foxes and Firebrands*. But when I inform my reader, that these two stories were looked upon as genuine by Bishop *Stillingfleet* (k), by Dr. *Cave* (l), by Dr. *South* (m), by Dr. *Scot* (n); and that long after Dr. *Collins* attacked their authenticity, the laborious and candid *Strype* admitted them into his *Collections* (o), few will think them of such dubious authority as B——r would represent (p).—However

I

(h) Page 59. (i) Reply, p. 20.

(k) Unreasonableness of Separation, Pref. from p. 11. to p. 30.

(l) Exhortation to Conformity.

(m) Sermons, Vol. 2. p. 110.

(n) The Use of Forms of Prayer.

(o) The Case of *Heath* mentioned in his *Annals of Queen Elizabeth*, vol. 1. p. 556.—*Commin*, mentioned in his *Life of Archbishop Parker*.

(p) The Reason insisted on by B——r, in his Note p. 22, 23. of his Reply, and quoted from Mr. *Withers*, why no credit is to be paid to the authority of *Foxes and Firebrands*,

I shall not insist on either of these facts; for I have it in my power to prove, from authorities not to be suspected, that Papists, contrary to *B——r's* assertion, have wore the disguise of Protestantism.

If then *Heath* and *Commin* did not disguise themselves as Protestants, what will *B——r* say to the story of *Campion* that arch-emissary of his own order? Hear then what *Cambden* says of him: "*Campion* being of *St. John's* College, bore the office of Proctor of the university in the year 1568, and being made Deacon, *dissembled the Protestant Religion* until he withdrew himself out of *England*."

Firebrands, is, that *Dr. Nalson*, the author, was punished by the House of Commons in 1670 for a *forgery of a like nature*.—Now, they, who have urged this as an objection to the credit of the two stories, either were ignorant, or pretended to be ignorant of the manner in which they were published. They do not rest on the authority of *Dr. Nalson*; for *Bishop Stillingsfleet*, in the place where he is quoted above, tells us, "That the examination of *Commin* is published from the *Lord Burleigh's* papers, which are in the hands of *Archbishop Usher*, and from him came to *Sir James Ware*, whose son brought them to *England*, and lately caused them to be printed."

In confirmation of this, it appears from the second edition of *Foxes and Firebrands*, printed in 1682, that one *R. W.*, who writes a Preface to it, mentions there, that he set forth in print in 1678, *the two Examinations*—and that the learned *Dr. Nalson* added a *few judicious Remarks and Collections of his own*. This *R. W.* tells us he has caused the First Part of *Foxes and Firebrands* to be reprinted, and a second added to it. Which Second Part is a long pamphlet, containing many *Detections* of disguised Papists, writ in a stile quite different from the First Part. Perhaps I may say with some certainty that this *R. W.* is the son of *Sir James Ware* spoken of by *Bishop Stillingsfleet*, and the same person with *Robert Ware Esq*; who in the 110th page of the second Part, is cited as one of three Gentlemen, before whom the truth of a detection of a disguised Papist was attested at *Dublin* in 1681.

“land (q).” Is *Cambden* also a lying legendary writer? If by such epithets, the credit of the Author of *Foxes and Firebrands* is to be overturned, dare even our hardened Jesuit pretend to apply them to the Historian of *Queen Elizabeth*? And doth not he, in the case of *Campion*, give us an instance of a person accepting of an office in a Protestant university, and receiving Deacon's orders in a Protestant church, and yet all the while a Papist?

If the evidence of the Protestant Historian do not confound *B—r*, what will he say to the evidence of a Protestant Archbishop, as I find it in *Strype*? From the passage in the Note, cited from Archbishop *Sandy's* Sermon before *Queen Elizabeth* in 1568, may we not see that dissimulation of religion was not peculiar at that time to *Campion*, but to Papists in general, and that warranted by his Holiness of *Rome*? (r)

When thou comest down to this period in thy Protestant History of the Popes, may we not expect to find the prejudices of our *Cambden* and our *Sandys* confuted and exposed?—But what wilt thou say to the formal evidence of the Protestant *Queen Elizabeth*, bearing witness to the disguises and hypocrisies of *Popish* emissaries in a solemn proclama-

(q) *Cambden's Elizabeth*, B. 2. p. 108. ad an. 1579.

(r) The Archbishop's words are, “In a paper which of late came from the Pope as a token to his dear children, there were printed the five wounds of Christ, with this poesy—*Fili, da mihi cor tuum, et sufficit*; that is, Son, give me thy heart, and it sufficeth. Whether his Holiness did mean thereby to allow dissimulation, or no, I will not define. His practices are mystical, and his brood are so thoroughly framed in this way, that they seem to take the Pope's emblem in no other meaning.

Strype's Annals, Vol. 3. b. 2. c. 19. p. 582.

Q

tion?

tion(s)? Must not this also be confuted? And how impatient ought every sincere Protestant to be, till the work comes down to the times of the Reformation, the only period when a History of the Popes can be interesting to us, and when thy History, if we may guess from so astonishing a specimen, will cure many ill grounded prejudices against Popery, and teach us to believe that we have nothing to fear from the concealed attacks of the Church of *Rome*?

The assurance of *B——r* in asserting that *the Pope cannot dispense* with a Papist's wearing the disguise of Protestantism, is astonishing. If, by *cannot*, he means that he cannot by the laws of the Gospel, it is a gross prevarication; if, by *cannot*, that he *does* not pretend to a right, the whole History of the Popedom shews this to be the most impudent of all assertions. In the Memoirs of *Madam Maintenon*, lately published, we have the following anecdote about *Constans d'Aubigné*, her father. "His father
" being informed that he was making a sale of his
" conscience to the *Jesuits*, forbid him to converse
" with them upon pain of incurring his curse. The
" *Jesuits* obtained a brief for him of the Pope, in
" which he was permitted to assist at the divine
" service and communion of the Protestant Church,
" till that happy moment came when it might be of
" use to declare himself a Catholic." (1) Now tho' *Mr. de la Beaumelle* pretends not to answer for the truth of the fact; when he adds, that the great *Theodore Agrippa d'Aubigné* in his secret Memoirs affirms this anecdote about his son to be true, few of my readers will venture to deny it.

(s) Strype's Annals of Eliz. vol. 4. p. 56. The proclamation dated 1591.

(t) P. 73. Eng. Transf. vol. 1.

Impartial history gives us instances of persons, who, tho' they have for years worn the disguise of protestantism, have, when they came to die, discovered themselves to be of the *Romish* communion. That *Charles II.* was a disguised papist, during his whole reign, is now no longer dubious; for *Carte* himself (*u*), however partial to his character, produces unquestionable evidence of his being a papist before the Restoration. But if there should be the least doubt about this, the certainty of such things happening may be confirmed from the two cases, of *Bishop Goodman*, and *Dr. Price*. The former was Bishop of *Gloucester* in *Charles I.*'s time; and yet this protestant bishop could say, in his last will—*I do profess that, as I have lived, so I die most constant in all the articles of our christian faith, and in all the doctrines of God's holy, catholic, and apostolic church, whereof I do acknowledge the church of Rome to be mother-church* (*x*).—By what *salvo* this person could reconcile it to his conscience to be guilty of so base hypocrisy, it is not for protestants, unacquainted with the mysterious policy of popery, to pronounce with certainty. The same observation may be made concerning *Dr. Theodore Price*, who died Sub-dean of *Westminster* in 1632, whose devotion to the church of *Rome* appeared upon his death-bed, as may be seen in *Bishop Hacket's* life of *Archbishop Williams* (*y*). From these two famous instances, our *dissenting brethren* will have a specimen of my impartiality; and see that, while I mean to unmask the enemies of the reformation, I mean no reflexion on the non-conformists to the church of *England*. Indeed, some of the ablest of the non-conformist divines have given

(*u*) See the life of the Duke of *Ormond*.

(*x*) See *Athen. Oxon.* v. i. p. 728.

(*y*) Part 2. p. 97.

their testimony as fully upon this subject, as any of the established church. And I shall not be afraid to give any offence to protestants of any denomination, by declaring it to be my opinion, that the divisions of protestants have been enlarged, and increased, by the incessant silent workings of *Popish* emissaries, under borrowed characters, when I can join to our *Brambells* (z), our *Groves* (a), our *Tennisons* (b), our *Caves* (c), our *Scots* (d), our *Stillingfleets* (e), the testimony of that great and worthy non-conformist, Mr. *Ph. Nye* (f), who speaks of *Satan's setting on foot*, by *Jesuits*, the variety of ways of religion amongst us. —Nor can I see the least reason, why it should be construed into a reproach on the body of dissenters, to say that *popish* emissaries have sometimes crept in amongst them. Can it reflect on the fidelity of an army to say, that two or three spies have been detected in their camp? At this rate, the established church would share the reproach. For, not to mention the dissimulation of a *Goodman* and a *Price*, it

(z) See Archbishop *Bramhall's* letter to Archbishop *Usher*.

(a) See Bishop *Grove's* *Persuasive to Communion with the Church of England*.

(b) See Archbishop *Tennison's* *Argument for Union*.

(c) *Exhortation to Conformity*.

(d) *Use of Forms of Prayer*.

(e) *History of Separation*.

(f) *Nye's Case*, p. 24, 25. Whoever would see more on this head, of disguised papists, may consult *Rushworth's Collections*, *Pryme's Works passim*, *Edward's Gangrene*, *Care's History of Plots*, *P. du Moulin's Works*, *Bates's Elenchus*, *Modern Machiavel*, *Ravilliac redivivus*, &c. &c. &c.

I shall add, as another confutation of B—r on this head, a declaration of *Oliver Cromwell*, published Oct. 31, 1655, where mention is made, *That Jesuits have been found among some discontented parties in this nation, who are observed to quarrel and fall out with every form or administration in the Church or State*.

was

was to the communion of the church of *England* that *B—r* hath declared himself a profelyte.—The truth is, the reproach can only begin, when the imposture is countenanced; and can be extended no farther, than to the individuals who refuse the means of conviction, not to the body, in general, amongst whom the impostor was concealed.

It is remarkable that *B—r*, when his own poultry, mean character is under consideration, objects to popish evidence; but when an important charge is brought against papists in general,—that of disguising themselves to divide protestants—then he appeals to popish divines for a confutation of it. Let him, if he can clear up this inconsistency, while I humour him so far as to produce two noted fathers of his own body, whose evidence he will not much like. What then will he say to the famous directions of the *Jesuit Contzens*, for introducing popery into a country, amongst which we read this—*To make as much of the divisions of enemies, as of the agreement of friends* (g). Does not this imply what I assert? For how can the Jesuits make much of the divisions of enemies, unless they foment them? And how can they do this, without those disguises in which protestants have often detected them? But another Jesuit, *Campanella*, speaks out. “Concerning the weakening the *English*, says he, there can be no better way possibly found out, than by causing divisions and dissensions among themselves.—And as for their religion, it cannot be so easily extinguished and rooted out, unless there were some certain schools set up in *Flanders*—by means of which there should be scattered abroad the seeds of schism, &c (b).”

(g) *Contz. Polit.* l. ii. chap. 18. sect. 9.

(b) *Campanella* on the Spanish Monarchy, c. 25. p. 157. as quoted by Archbishop *Tennison*.

When

When Mr. B—r shall be able to prove the existence of *Vincenzo della Torre*, and the genuineness of *F. Montecuccoli's* letter, then will he be able to prove, that he did not mean to undermine the protestant religion by his bold denial of popish dissimulation, permitted to serve the great interests of their church, so clearly detected by protestants, and so fully owned by *Jesuits* themselves.—I shall produce the evidence of one more *Jesuit* upon this point, whose authority, I think, every one of my readers will, at least, put upon a level with that of *A—d B—r*. I have in my eye the renowned *Titus Oates*. If this worthy gentleman had ever heard of Mr. B—r's doctrine, that papists are not allowed to wear the disguise of protestants, would he have filled his narrative with so many discoveries of such histories? I say nothing of *Oates's* pretensions to credibility; every one of my readers must judge for himself, without waiting for my opinion. But whether he discovered a real plot, as the nation at the time believed, or only dressed up a fiction of his own brain, as all the late historians agree, thus far must be admitted, that a man who had been amongst the *Jesuits*, as *Oates* certainly was, must have known what was permitted to be done by the *Jesuits*; and, consequently, he is a witness very proper to be confronted with B—r; and, I protest, I see no reason why the *Salamanca* doctor should not be believed, in this instance, preferable to the *Jesuit* of *Macerata*. The latter denies the possibility of facts known to be true; whereas the former, at the worst, only asserts such facts as, tho' false, yet possibly might have happened.

When we observe the amazing boldness of B—r in denying that papists are ever allowed to wear the disguise of protestantism, and consider those incontestable proofs which I have produced to confute him,

him, and which he must certainly have known would be produced; this ought, in every other instance to make us suspect him, nay doubt the truth of his assertions, in proportion as he is peremptory in making them. But he had much at stake; and having, for so many years, relied so much on Protestant credulity, he might hope that this additional and strange falshood would pass unnoted. At the worst he could only be detected, and, to use the words of a great political writer, *abandoned fellows never value the shame of being detected, provided they think the lie will be of service to them for a day, or even for an hour* (i). But this is a falshood of such consequence, that the detection of it, must, for ever, ruin B——r's pretensions to be a sincere Protestant. By asserting it, he gives us a most convincing proof of his inclinations to serve Popery. For could he once get this to be believed, he would do more harm to Protestantism than a hundred quartos, full of invective against the Popes, would do good; because open attacks from Papists we need not fear, but their secret workings are the more dangerous, as they cannot be guarded against, and therefore, in this way, as we have seen from the above-mentioned facts, Papists have ever since the Reformation, chosen to direct their attacks.

And now I may, with confidence appeal to the impartial public, and ask who has the best pretensions to be looked upon as a friend to Protestantism, I, who without reserve have thought it my duty to warn Protestants to be upon their guard where there is most danger of the enemy's approach, and would fix their attention on a most alarming mystery of Popish policy working incessantly amongst us, or He, who attempts to lull them into a deceitful security,

(i) *Craftsman's* Vindication of his Patron.

rity, and does what in him lies to tear up Protestantism from the very root, and expose it to those snares which alas, have been but too successfully employed already, and which such instruments as *B——r*, can, most successfully continue to employ.

What could induce our pretended convert to throw off the mask so unguardedly, can only be guessed. It seems most probable that he was willing to atone for the severe reflections he had found it necessary in his own defence to make on the *mental restrictions, equivocation, and reservations of Jesuitism*, and to pour oil into the wounds which he himself had made. Unhappily, forced to defend himself at the expence of his old friends, in one instance, by vindicating them from another charge, a charge continued from the Reformation, in the writings of our divines and in the narratives of our historians; and a charge, the disproving of which would be of the utmost consequence to the cause of Popery, he was in hopes, perhaps, of securing not only pardon for his former transgressions, but future favour and reward from the venerable body.

Happy for our Protestant kingdom, this assertion, as effectually disproved as it was impudently made, will meet with no credit, unless perhaps amongst some of his blinded admirers; who, no doubt, in good time, aided by such a counsellor, will have their eyes opened, and get the better of those other Protestant prejudices, which their convert, ever ready, as he tells us, to vindicate Popery when unjustly attacked, so strenuously labours to efface.

C H A P.

C H A P. XXIV.

Conclusion of the Controversy.

AS I revived this subject, about which the public in general had long ago formed its judgment, not to reply to sophistry and evasion, but to produce new evidence; not with a view to rob Mr. B——r of those friends whom he may still have left, but to gratify the curiosity of those whose eyes were already opened, by making this detection more complete; this, I say, being my principal view in the present performance, and having so fully executed it, I think it is now full time to take my leave.

But before I close this controversy, while I express myself happy in having my labours to undeceive the public, amply recompensed by the very general approbation of Protestants of all denominations, it is not without concern that I must observe that some few persons are still *fascinated* by the arts of the deceiver, persons for whose characters both as lovers of truth, and as men of abilities, I have all proper respect. Tho' in the heat of controversy, full of my subject, and of the commanding proofs by which I had unmasked the *Jesuit*, I let fall some general expressions, which might imply, that I put Mr. B——r's few remaining friends upon a level, I know that much may be ascribed to unsuspecting friendship and long habit of good opinion, much may be imputed to goodness of heart always *most exposed to the snares of artifice*, without resolving a rejection of convincing evidence entirely into want of judgment, or want of candor. And whatever may be my opinion of some other persons who have injuriously censured my motives in the detection of B——r, this I can prove from my

R

former

former pamphlets on this subject—that I had a just sense of the merit of at least two or three of this man's friends. And having done justice to their characters when I declared my opinion at my first setting out in the controversy, *that they would not have honoured B——r with their friendship, if they had not thought him the man of truth and religion (a)*; having farther declared, in the conclusion of my last pamphlet, that the dissent of some of Mr. B——r's friends *from the voice of the impartial public hath not been owing (such is my opinion of their worth) to any backwardness to admit the truth (b)*; having, I say, such proofs to appeal to, I shall not reproach myself, if notwithstanding this public acknowledgment, I should still be so unfortunate as not to obtain their good opinion, which, as I expressed myself formerly, *I should be proud to obtain—and which surely I have done nothing to forfeit.*

At all events—I shall remain, perfectly satisfied with the pleasing reflection of having done my duty, as a sincere Protestant, and with having found the most learned and respectable of the established clergy, and indeed the public in general agreeing with me in my sentiments on this affair, and looking upon the detection of an insolent deceiver, as a debt due to that public which he had imposed upon, to that church of which he had pretended to be a champion, and to which he hath pretended to be a convert.

I venerate the character of the sufferer for religion and conscience; but I would recommend care and circumspection in allowing the claim to such a character. In this view the detection of B——r will be

(a) See Letters ill. p. 9:

(b) Full Conf. p. 91:

of singular service to the public; it will not deter the real *Convert*, but only the dissembling profligate, from seeking an *asylum* with Protestants. And while future *Gavins*, future *Fourniers*, future *Blacks*, and future *B——rs* will no longer attempt their impossibilities, the real profelyte for Conscience, who can give a satisfactory account of the motives of his change, who can produce proofs of his being the person he pretends to be, and after his coming amongst us lives a life suitable to the *purity and sanctity* expected from a man in his circumstances; such a Person need never fear the kindest reception and the warmest encouragement, from a people who have the satisfaction to boast of having extended their protection to a *Courayer*, whose innocence, abilities, and learning exalt his character above all commendation; and whose immortal labours to destroy the *essential* corruptions of Popery, cannot but make us think it a public loss, that he should have the *least* objection to put it in our power to elevate him to a distinguished station in that Protestant church which he hath so nobly defended.

And now, after all that has been said, I flatter myself, no sincere and sensible Protestant will be under the least concern, if this controversy should deprive us of the *History of the Popes* by *A——d B——r Esq*; For, tho' the Man, even after his book hath been demonstrated to be as much a counterfeit as himself, hath still the assurance to say, that *men of the greatest learning have looked upon it as the most effectual blow that ever was given to Popery (a)*; if he can produce, by name, any one man of acknowledged (I will not say great but) competent learning, who will give it as his opinion, that his *History of the Popes* is, I wont say the *most effectual blow*, but any blow at all, I will agree to subscribe to the truth

(c) Reply, p. 23,

of his miraculous escape, and will admit that a letter signed *J. Montecuccoli* could possibly be writ by *Pius Æneas Montecuculi*, and allow that *Vincenzo della Torre* died in the Inquisition at *Macerata*, tho' I have proved that he never lived.

However, tho' I may be instrumental in depriving my countrymen of *B——r's* History, I have been the means of giving them one which is certainly a better. The translation of the *French History* of the Popes, now publishing, in which the rise and progress of the papal usurpations, corruptions and superstitions, are faithfully and strongly represented, will make ample amends for interrupting the publication of the crude collections of the Plagiary of *Tillemont*. And as the detection of this strange man hath given occasion to a gentleman of learning to think of putting into the hands of his countrymen this History, published (if not writ) by *Bruys*, and to add to the value of the original, by some useful and sensible notes, it gives me real satisfaction to reflect, that I can reckon *this* as one of the many real advantages which the Protestant inhabitants of *Great Britain* will reap from the detection of *A——d B——r*.

One thing more is necessary to inform the public, before I take my final leave of a controversy, which I have so entirely exhausted; that the seven letters to Father *Shelden*, the receipts for the annuity from the *Jesuits*, and the authentic papers and certificates from *Italy*, are soon to be deposited in the *Bodleian Library* at *Oxford*, by which means every one may have access to inspect and to examine them, Mr. *B——r* himself may have full liberty to find out the marks of fraud or forgery, hitherto unproved; and posterity, if this detection shall reach posterity, may be able to form a judgment of the real character of *A——d B——r*.

P O S T S C R I P T.

WHILE the foregoing Detection was in the press, a pamphlet appeared under the title of *Some very remarkable Facts lately discovered, relating to the Conduct of the Jesuits, with regard to Mr. Bower, &c.* a pamphlet so contemptible in every view, that I should have left it to that obscurity into which hypocritical cant, misplaced abuse, and wild bombast will always sink, if I had not been willing, at the winding up of the controversy, to give the public a convincing proof how desperate is the case of Mr. B——, who can think of catching at such straws to save himself from drowning.

One *William Arnold*, lately an Apothecary in *St. Albans Street*, but who has *disappeared* out of that neighbourhood, is the hero of the piece, and in two letters, without dates, to *somebody* said to be a clergyman of the church of *England*, who writes an Introduction and Conclusion, very free use is made of the names of *Sir Henry Bedingsfeld*, and of the Reverend Mr. *Douglas*, about a story of a sister of *Arnold* whom *B——r* had courted.—These two gentlemen have given me full liberty to lay before the public their account of the transaction, and the insinuations of *Arnold* to their disadvantage will appear to be groundless, and confuted by himself.

Upon desiring *Sir H. B.* to give me an account of his conversation with this *Arnold*. “ In the first place, he said, “ he hoped his character stood not in need of any justification; that he flattered himself all those persons to whom “ he had the honour to be known would do him the justice “ to believe him incapable of forfeiting his word of honour; “ and as for what Mr. *B——r* or his new advocate the “ Apothecary, can or will say of him, tho’ attested by oaths “ *authentically recorded*, they never will give him either the “ least satisfaction or the least uneasiness. The Apothecary, “ *Sir Henry* said, informed him of *B——r*’s courtship to “ his sister of many years standing, and that he had burnt “ (*Sir Harry* believes he said a year before) a whole bag
“ or

“ or bushel full of B——r’s letters to his sister, some of
 “ which were in *Italian*—that whenever B——r was
 “ pressed about the article of marriage with his sister he
 “ evaded or shuffled it off, by saying, he could not think of
 “ settling till a law-suit he had in *Scotland* about an estate,
 “ was determined. He farther told Sir H. that his sister,
 “ upon hearing B——r’s marriage confirmed, was deeply
 “ affected with it, *that she pined away*, and died in a few
 “ months after—not (continued the Apothecary) that I can
 “ positively affirm that was the cause of her death—God
 “ forbid I should—but grief, Sir, grief, you know—there he
 “ paus’d and wept.”

Sir H. B. farther observed to me, and very justly, “ That
 “ the Apothecary cannot, upon recollection, think himself
 “ much obliged to his new friend, who makes him relate
 “ and declare all the particulars of B——r’s courtship to
 “ his sister to him (Sir H. B.) under the sacred sanction of
 “ his word of honour for secrecy; and *that in the presence*
 “ *of an elderly gloomy looking gentleman, with his arm in a*
 “ *black sling, who was by all the while, and who, he owns,*
 “ *was an entire stranger to him (a),* even without previously
 “ asking whether that gloomy gentleman could be trusted
 “ with the secret. Sure (continued Sir H.) when the Apo-
 “ thecary saw a stranger in the room with his arm hung in
 “ a black sling, (who, for aught he then knew, might be a
 “ captain of militia, as well as *the eminent Jesuit Carteret*),
 “ it would have been but natural for him, and what com-
 “ mon sense would have dictated to any body, to desire
 “ Sir H. to withdraw with him to another room, if, what
 “ he *intended* to relate, he *intended* should be secret. Pro-
 “ bably, and Sir H. believes it to be true, that the next
 “ time *Arnold* waited upon him, upon giving him his sister’s
 “ letters to read, he desired secrecy, as they regarded only
 “ family transactions. Sir H. B. found them so, and ac-
 “ cordingly sealed them up very carefully, and returned them
 “ to *Arnold* by his servant (b).

The

(a) P. 12.

(b) For what end could Sir H. B. desire to know the particulars
 of B——r’s courtship of Mrs. *Arnold* from her brother’s own
 mouth? It could not be for private curiosity: for *Arnold* owns

(p. 12.)

The above particulars I took down from Sir *H. B*—*d*'s own mouth, which, he will, I make no doubt, confirm to any one who shall speak to him on the subject.

The following letter from Mr. *Arnold* to the Reverend Mr. *Douglas*, a copy of which himself hath published, is a full confutation of the vile insinuations used to represent Mr. *D.* as one who would have endeavoured to make him charge *B*—*r* as the murderer of his sister (c). I have reprinted it exactly from the original put into my hands without presuming to alter the grammar or spelling.

Reverend Sir,

I have maturely Consider'd of your Application to me, and say in answer; that I Can't Consent to having the *ashes* of my Dear Sister disturb'd after so many Years *laying* Quiet, as the Affair on the Carpet *have* never been publicly talkt of by me, or any of her other Relations or friends. Sir *Harry Bedingfeld* Can't but Remember, when I had the Honour to wait on him, that I then enjoin'd him to Secrecy, on my Sister's Account, as much may be said about it. I do now declare to you, I am absolutely against it, and am, Sir,

Your most humble Servant,

St. *Allins* Street,

W^m. ARNOLD.

November 28. 1756.

P. S. I am sorry I am prevented by particular business from waiting on you in Person as I had engaged.

Can

(p. 12.) that Sir *H.* had been acquainted with the whole affair before, and for the same reason Sir *H. B.* could not be disappointed upon *Arnold's* telling him he had no letter of *B*—*r's*—vex'd, I own, he might be. It could not be to strengthen the opinion Sir *H. B.* had of *B*—*r*; by Sir *H's* behaviour one may conclude he entertained the same opinion of him at that time, as nine parts out of ten of the nation entertain of him at this juncture. Must it not, then, be for reasons not consistent with secrecy, reasons obvious to every one that has read or heard of the six letters? Sure this accusation against Sir *H. B.* of breaking his word of honour, in its own nature destroys itself!

(c) P. 31.

Can any one read the foregoing letter, and not be amazed, that a charge should now be brought, that Mr. *A.* was desired to attest any thing more than was true? Every one who peruses it must see, that when it was writ (which was since the only time that the writer and Mr. *D.* ever spoke together) he had not then taken it into his head to represent Mr. *D.* as one who had endeavoured to make him charge *B—r* as the murderer of his sister, contrary to truth. For in this letter, which we know was really writ by *Arnold*, there is the fullest acknowledgement that he was asked to say nothing but the truth. *He will not disturb the ashes of his sister—the affair has not been publicly talkt of by him, or any of her other relations—he had enjoined secrecy on his sister's account—much might be said about it.* These are his own words, words which imply every thing that could possibly be expressed of the truth of the case which he was desired to ascertain publicly, and which he thought proper not to consent to (*d*).

Another charge against Mr. *D.* is, that he broke his word to *W. A.* with regard to the publication of the story. But as *Arnold's* own letter confuted the first charge, this is answered by the printed pamphlets themselves, in which the intelligence concerning Mrs. *A.* that is supposed to have come from Mr. *D.* is contained. For so far is *B—r's* courtship of Mrs. *A.* as related by her brother to Sir *H.* and confirmed by him to Mr. *D.* from being published in these pamphlets, that in *Bower and Tillemont*, where it was first hinted at, without any names at all, the reason is given why it was not published, viz. *Left the relation of it should give pain to persons of merit, whose injured relations have experienced that Mr. B—r has no regard to the most sacred obligations (e);* and tho' the story is again just hinted at in the *Full Confutation (f)*, care was taken not to put the name at full length, nor to mention any of the circumstances, nor upon whose authority it was related, nor any one particular that could make the story public, or known to any but to those immediately concerned, or point out the person to be Mrs. *Arnold a Milliner at Bath, and sister to William Arnold Apothecary in St. Alban's Street.*

(*d*) Happy is it for Mr. *D.* that he did not receive *Arnold's* answer by word of mouth; and that he can appeal to so authentic a proof as the above letter. as a confutation of the vile charge.

(*e*) P. 82.

(*f*) P. 43.

Mr.

Mr. D. was in full possession of the story, from Sir H. B. without any injunction of secrecy, and consequently had full right to speak of it publicly upon that authority. But, as he had not been able to procure the authority of the brother, he was so delicate as to deny himself the right he really had; little dreaming, that so ungenerous a return could have been the consequence.

But Mr. A. having himself thought proper to *disturb the ashes of his sister*, Mr. D. thinks himself free from all kind of obligation to conceal any longer what he had from Arnold's own mouth about the courtship, and hath given me leave to mention that, besides the particulars *attested* above by Sir H. B. Mr. A. (who said not a word of his hearing this only from his sister's maid-servant, but spoke of it as of a transaction, of the truth of which he had the highest evidence) told him, that B—r had taught his sister Italian—that many of his letters to her were signed *Husband*—that she had refused good offers on B—r's account, and, in particular, Mr. — an attorney at Bath; and that, tho' he could not positively say what was the real cause of her death, for her health had suffered by an unsuccessful law-suit, yet that, from the time she heard of B—r's marriage, she *took little or no nourishment but what she got from cordials, and died in a few months.* — These particulars, and the name of the relater, would never have been publicly mentioned by this gentleman, if he had not been forced to speak out in his own vindication.—I shall only add with regard to Mr. D. that he is not ashamed to be looked upon as one of the many clergymen of the church of England, a list of whose names would be very formidable to Mr. B—r, who think the tracing of the charge against him to the bottom is doing a real service to the protestant religion. Sir H. B—d's intimacy with protestants of the first distinction, will account to those, who know any thing of Mr. D's connexions, for his having had early access to know of the *Six Letters*, the foundation of the charge. Hoping and wishing to find Mr. B—r innocent (g), he used

(g) Mr. D. can give a most convincing proof of his being inclined to serve Mr. B. in this affair, before this was rendered impossible. Mr. D. heard of the letters to Sheldon in the Spring 1755, that is, near a year before he saw them himself. Shocked

he used the utmost circumspection in forming his judgment concerning them; and, having formed it upon evidence which he thought incontestable, he can reflect on the part he has acted with regard to this dispute, with the pleasing satisfaction of having done nothing but what he thought was his duty as a good subject, an honest man, and a protestant clergyman. The only thing he can blame himself for, is his having hazarded a private conversation with a man he knew nothing of—a conversation which, had not the above letter been writ, it might have been *possible* to misrepresent; since, even tho' the letter exists, the attempt has been made.

A few remarks on the other parts of the pamphlet which occasions this postscript, will present us with a curious specimen of folly and inconsistency.

P. 16. *Arnold's* Jesuit confessor is made to tell him, *That they have great things in the gift of their order* with which *B—r* had been tempted. *B—r* tells the public, over and (*b*) over again, making this one of the capital arguments against the genuineness of the letters, that the Jesuits had nothing which could tempt him from his advantageous situation here. —Is the Jesuit confessor, or the Ex-jesuit *B—r*, to be believed?

P. 17. Mr. *Arnold* is made to say, that his Jesuit confessor told him that *Aspinwall* died an obstinate heretic.—The

at the news, and unwilling to believe any thing hastily to the disadvantage of a person who appeared in the character of a protestant champion, he thought it an act of humanity to think of apprizing Mr. *B.* of the charge which was levelled against him: and, as this was a very delicate affair, he waited on a gentleman, who, he knew, frequently saw Mr. *B.* and begged him to communicate this intelligence to his friend, because, the sooner he knew it, it would be in his power to guard himself more effectually, and be better prepared for his defence. Whoever would know the certainty of this fact, may receive satisfaction from Dr. *Macaulay* an eminent physician in *Poland-Street*,—who was the gentleman Mr. *D.* waited upon, as above; who accordingly called upon Mr. *Bowyer* three or four times for that purpose, but he was told soon after that he was gone into the country, so that he did not see him for several months.

(*b*) See his copies of the letters, p. 22. his Second Part, p. 48. his Reply, p. 25.

author

author of the Six Letters Illustrated mentions the report of his dying a papist.—Admirable proof of the confederacy ridiculously asserted, between the detector of B—r and the Jesuits!—Any other person would have drawn a very different inference, and would have confessed, from this very instance, that the detector had *only* protestant information to assist him; and if this report, known to be very public amongst protestants who remembered Dr. Aspinwall, be a false one, the mentioning of it has *luckily* been the occasion of doing justice to the Doctor's memory.

Arnold makes his *Jesuit* give a hideous character of a gentleman whom they supposed to be the detector of B—r, saying that he was the *means of all this disturbance—by over-acting his part* (p. 23.), and calling *the whole a very unchristian proceeding* (p. 20). Does this prove that the detection of B—r came from the *Jesuits*? Perhaps the *Jesuit* called it *unchristian*, because it is *anti-papish*; an offence which a sincere protestant has, no doubt, great reason to be ashamed of.

P. 23. This *Arnold* says, when B—r and *Tillemont* came out, it made *the cause of the persecution against B—r very conspicuous to him. viz.—The History of the Popes*—*Bower* says it was.—The author of the Comparison, on the other hand, says he wrote his pamphlet to expose the insufferable insolence and vanity of that pretence, by shewing that a miserable plagiary could never be formidable to the church of *Rome*.

Here are two different facts asserted by the two parties. How shall we get to the knowledge of the truth? By observing the method employed to discredit the history.—If a real, formidable book was to be discredited, the method was to expose the ill faith of the historian, in falsifying or perverting facts. If the ridiculous pretence of a foolish book's being formidable be to be exposed, what is the method then? Without doubt, to shew the man to be an insignificant plagiary.—The author of *Bower and Tillemont compared*, has pursued this latter method, and fully proved his point.

By these letters of *Arnold's* it appears, that if there was a popish plot against B—r, it has been carried on in a very
S 2 different

different manner from what plots,—especially popish plots, have been carried on, *viz.* neither by false evidence, nor forged papers. According to these two infamous letters, the *Jesuits* hunted for *B—r*'s handwriting, till one of them was almost dead (i) How needless, if they were such masters of the art of forgery! When they were unable to authenticate the Six Letters, they confess no forgery.—When they press *Arnold* to give his testimony, they desire him to say nothing but the truth, as appears from his letter to Mr. *D.* which must remain a lasting monument of the writer's being a fit champion for such a cause.

But if *Arnold*'s modesty be on the stretch, this is nothing in respect of our anonymous clergyman, who has the front after he has laid before the eyes of the public these two letters, to insult their understanding as never human understanding was before insulted—where he says, that *B—r* is thereby cleared of the principal articles of the charge brought against him—of associating with the *Jesuits*—of lending money to *Hill*, (k) &c. Whereas there is nothing in the letters that has the least tendency to free *B—r* from those charges, all *Arnold*'s discourse with the *Jesuits* being long posterior to those transactions, all which are charged upon him to have been prior to the publication of his history. Can this possibly be said by a clergyman of the church of *England*? Can it possibly be said by any man but *B—r* himself?

The note (A) p. 35. detects the imposture of the pamphlet. Could a clergyman, could any other man, could any other creature but *B—r* himself, say he wonders a single person can be found in this whole nation, who could swallow the gross nonsense, &c. of the detector of *B—r*, when he must know that the detections have been read, and carefully read, by the most eminent men in the kingdom, for rank, station, and literature; and when he must know further, that the body of these have declared, in all conversations, their thorough persuasion of the truth of the charge in all its material circumstances? This compliment on the public judgment could come only from *B—r* himself, and from *B—r* in despair.

(i) P. 14.

(k) P. 34.

P. 37. Note (B). B—r is now at his last gasp, and catches at any thing to save himself from drowning: he cajoles the dissenters of all denominations—but to little purpose; for he will find, that they are equally his enemies with the established clergy, and for the same reason—they are friends to truth. As to *Commin* and *Heath*, if they be real parallels of B—r, I should indeed think them; as this man calls them, *imaginary impostors*; for I believe one must have recourse to the *inventive faculty* of the imagination, to match him.

P. 39. *Providence*, we are told, *has seasonably interposed*, &c. in favour of B—r. This is just the same kind of providence that interposed in the wonders of his escape; only with this difference, that, tho' he escaped the inquisition, he never will escape the author of his detection.

P. 40. (D.) He tells us as confidently that the Jesuits offered B—r all *they could offer, and he could desire, to regain him*, as if he had it under their hands. But we have it under B—r's hand, that *he courted them to be received to grace*. Now, see the evidence on either part. The first is collected from a letter without date, written by a man without abode; and all this on the faith of the most wretched anonymous scribler that ever defiled paper. The other, that B—r courted the Jesuits, is on the faith of a series of original letters, that have undergone all kind of scrutiny to ascertain their authenticity.

The exhortations of the *outrageous* scribler cannot be read seriously—*Let him, in the next place, ask pardon of his Prince—for vilifying and debasing a man whom he hath been pleased to honour, (l) &c.* I shall expect, that the college of physicians will be arraigned shortly, by the sellers of quack medicines, published in the news-papers under the authority of the royal licence, for laughing, or exclaiming against those numerous and vile impostures.

B—r's *displaying truth, and unmasking popery*, of which he talks so wildly (m), is an exploit much like *Falstaff's*. The work is not now to do. It has been done long ago by our

(l) P. 45. (m) P. 46, 47.

Chillingworths and our *Barrows*. Or, if the breathless bulk of popery was to be killed over again, I confess that *B—r's* wooden dagger was as fit as any other for this mighty exploit.

P. 47. (Note *F.*) “It is hard to say, which Mr. *B—r* hath reason to dread most, the holy inquisition of *Macerata*, or the new inquisition of Father *D—s*.” It is easily determined. Mr. *B—r* hath most reason to dread the latter. For, tho’ he did once run some risk from *Pius Æneas Montecuculi*, Vicar of *Macerata*, we know that the tribunal of *J. Montecuccoli*, Lord Inquisitor, never existed but to give exercise to Mr. *B—r's* providences. As to that of *F. D.* it never was employed, nor never will be employed, but to detect impostors, who are become a scandal and disgrace to society. And if this is to be called an inquisition, I hope, he, and every lover of truth, every friend of protestantism, will, by the grace of God, exercise it on any fitting occasion, without consulting any besides their conscience, their honour, th r duty.

I join, with this good divine, in wishing, at his conclusion, all possible things to Mr. *B—r*. He may go *down to the grave in peace, full of years (n)*,—full of money. But how he should go down *full of honour*, after having so perfectly emptied himself of it, I cannot conceive. Would it not be a better wish then, and conclude the period as well—to say, *full of repentance*?

And now it is full time to take my leave of the two *Sofias* of the farce, the country clergyman, and his dear friend Mr. *B—r*, who are perpetually encountering each other. The clergyman never appears but the Ex-jesuit, his second self, is disturbing the scene; and the *He Sofia* enters into all the quarrels, interests, passions, of the *J. Sofia* so entirely, that they are changing persons in every period. And the whole pamphlet presents us with the truest image of one of those incoherent dreams, in which we are busied in catching at one person, who immediately becomes another the moment you attempt to seize him. As to Mr. *Arnold*, who has commen-

ced a great author, and so much improved in his *grammar* and *spelling* since Nov. 28, 1756, may he, I wish it sincerely, keep, for the future, steady to that faith to which he is returned, and be proof against new *convictions*.

And once more I take a *final leave* of my old friend the *Jesuit*, whom I congratulate on his honourable place in the *Bodleian Library*, where his friends and his enemies may visit him at pleasure, and read lectures on *similitude of bands* and *attested records*, and become acquainted with the offspring of his brain,—*Vincenzo della Torre* and *J. Montecuculli*. Future attempts to perpetuate his impositions on protestants, may call forth future detectors; and new evidence may come to light *even still*. In either of these cases, the *B-w-rian* controversy may revive—but, at present, the public will expect hostilities, at least on my part, to cease,

N. B. The publication of this pamphlet was delayed some days, in hopes of seeing Mr. B—r's *One very remarkable Fact* more, advertised to be published on *Thursday* last. If this *Fact* be of as little consequence to his justification, as the other *very remarkable Facts* to which we have here given a proper reply, it would be unworthy of our notice; and if it should turn out to be only a repetition of *personal abuse*, the public will justly look upon it as the last agonies of an expiring impostor. But, if any answer should appear to be in the least necessary, such answer shall be immediately printed, and given *gratis*; the gentlemen concerned in this detection being determined to put the public to no farther expence on a subject already so entirely exhausted.

March 27. 1747

Dear Sir

I have taken, it is true, one desperate step, but it not irretrievable, and I call God to witness, I am ready to retrieve it, having been the most miserable and unhappy wretch upon earth ever since I took it. But I must immediately withdraw from hence. Shall I do it without satisfying or acquainting the woman and her relations? If you approve of it, I am ready to go where you please. My dear friend Mr. Carlet would receive me with open arms. Could I any way satisfy the woman, I might in that case retire without any trouble or noise. If in this you can help me for Christ Jesus's sake, don't delay it. My dearest friend, your letter has revived me, it gives me some hopes of being still saved by your means and I heartily wish I had not so rash in complying with those who believe themselves my friends. I sincerely repent what I have done, and with God's grace shall proceed in it no farther. The moment I am free, I shall

be entirely at your disposal, and with infinite
satisfaction obey your commands. Euse ego mitte me
Dear Sir I am
Your most obliged Humble Servant
A B

Sept 3 1746

Received this day of Mr Shaddon by the hands of
Mr Hill the sum of forty seven pounds fori shilling,
being in full of a half a year's annuity due the 27
of August last. Received, I say by me.
N. Bower.

The writing Engraved on these two plates hath
been faithfully represented stroke for stroke from the
Letter & Receipt put into my Hands for that purpose
by me
Rich: Bennett.

St. Pauls Church
Strand.

N U M B. II.

FIDEM facio per presentes Ego S. Romæ et Universalis Inquisitionis, Notarius infra-scriptus, qualiter diligenter perquisitis Regiftris Patentatorum S. Officii Anconæ, inveni P. Archibaldum Bowers, Societatis. Jesu, natione Anglum, nunquam fuisse neque esse Consultorem pro dicto S. Officio Anconæ, in Civitate Maceratenſi. In quorum fidem, &c, datum Romæ ex Palatiq dictæ S. Inquisitionis, hac die 4 Decembris, 1756.

Ita est Ego EUSEBIUS ANT^o. CALABRINUS
S. Romæ et Unalis Inq^{alis} Not^{us} in fide.

N. B. The Impression of the Seal
not being strong, the Engraver
could not trace it exactly.



T

Quanto

N U M B. III.

Macerata, 19 Marzo, 1757.

— Quanto ha scritto, se circa il Conte Vincenzo della Torre, e che lui sia stato consultor del S. Ufficio è tutto falsissimo arcifalsissimo, e se lui non se n'andava sarebbe incappato lui nel S. Ufficio per neri attentati. Sappia, che i Gesuiti in questo stato mai han potuto porre il naso nel S. Ufficio, nè sotto questo Cielo è stato mai il Conte Vincenzo della Torre. Rispondo questi pochi versi, acciò non m'accusi negligente a suoi domandi, e costantemente mi rassegnò

Suo Servo Oblig^{mo}

P. ASCENZIARIU.

Macerata, 30 Aprile, 1757.

A. C. Pronē Stifs^{mo}

SUBITO tornato il Padre Vicario del S. Ufficio, non mancai comunicarle la sua intorno alli supposti fatti falsi stampati del Padre Bouer indegno Apostata, ed il medemò m' accertò esser tutto falso, tanto dell' esser Consultore, quanto del fatto di Vincenzo della Torre, ma siccome qui non è Inquisizione, non vi è il registro de Patentati, e però aurebbe scritto all' Inquisitor d' Ancona, per far venir le Giustificazioni; L' Inquisitor gl' hà risposto, che già gl' erano note tutte l' inique falsità scritte dal Bouer, e che di tutto aveva mandato in Roma autentiche giustificazioni per doverli inviare a Londra dal Personaggio che gl' ele hà richiesto, le quali al giunger di questo faranno costi, onde sopra ciò fati. — Sempre pronto a fervirla mi rassegnò di lei Ser^a, Obf.

PROSPERO ASCENZIARIU.

NOS

N U M B. IV.

NOS F. Joseph Ignatius Zabberoni de Ravenna Ordⁱ Prædicatorum Sac. Theologiæ Magister, et in Civitatibus, ac Diocesibus Anconæ, Auximi, Oesii, Senogagiæ, Laureti, Recineti, Maceratæ, Tolentini, aliisq; Terris, et Locis annexis, et consuetis, Marchiæ Anconitanæ Inquisitor Generalis à sancta sede Apostolica contra hæreticam pravitatem specialiter delegatus;

FIDEM facimus, et in verbo veritatis attestamus, imprimis, *nunquam* exercuisse Officium Inquisitoris nec Qualificatoris Reverendum Patrem in Christo *Archibaldum Bower, Soc. Jesu, natione Scoticum*. Secundo; eodem modo supradicto fidem facimus et confirmamus, S. Inquisitionem *Maceratæ* subjectam esse huic nostræ Inquisitioni Generali Anconæ, et *semper* nos deputasse nostrum Vicarium ibi, scilicet *Maceratæ*, vel nostri Predecessores; unde manifestè constat, ut supra, *nunquam* fuisse ibi vel *Inquistorem*, vel *Qualificatorem* supradictum Patrem *Archibaldum Bower, Soc. Jesu*, Et etiam constat ex dictis nostram Inquisitionem generalem esse Anconæ, et illam *Maceratæ* subjectam esse nostræ generali Anconæ. In quorum fidem, &c. quæque et manu nostrâ subscripsimus, et sigillo nostræ S. Inquisitionis firmavimus.

Datum ex nostris Ædibus S. Inquisitionis Generalis Anconæ, Kal. Aprilis, Anno Domini 1757.



Ita est F. JOSEPH IGNATIUS ZABBERONI,
Inq^r Generalis Anconæ, manu propria.

N U M B. V.

NOS F. Joseph Ignatius Zabberoni de Ravenna Ordinis Prædicatorum, Sac. Theologiæ Magister ; In Civitatibus, et Diocæsi- bus Anconæ, Æesii, Senogagliæ, Laureti, Recinetti, Maceratæ, Tolentini, Auximi, Cinguli, nec non in aliis locis annexis, et consuetis Marchiæ Anconitanæ contra Hæreticam pravitatem à S. Sede Apostolica specialiter Delegatus Inquisitor Generalis.

UNIVERSIS, ac singulis has nostras visuris, lecturis pariter, et audituris fidem indubiam facimus, atque testamur Officium SS^{mæ} Inquisitionis in Civitate, ac Diæcesi Maceraten- si non solum ante Annum 1720, sed a sua Origine subjec- tum fuisse, prout est de præsentis huic nostræ Anconitanæ Ge- nerali Inquisitioni, ac gubernari per Vicarium Foraneum nobis subjectum ; Et à die 5 Maii 1724, usque ad diem 20 Martii 1731, munus Vicarii Foranei Maceratensis in omnibus quoad officium subditè Prædecessoribus nostris exercuisse R. P. Lec- torem F. Pium Æneam Montecuculi, prout apparet in Registro Patentatorum ad pag. 42. In quorum Fidem &c. Datum An- conæ ex Ædibus SS^{mæ} Inquisitionis die 17 Novembris 1757.



Ita est F. JOSEPH IGNATIUS
ZABBERONI, Inq^r Gen^{lis}
manu propria.

ANGELUS BONVINI, Notarius,
et Cancel^s Gen^{lis} S. Inqu^{is}.

N U M B. VI.

In Nome di Dio. Amen.

A Chiunque vedrà, leggera, e udirà parimente questa mia lettera, fo piena, ed indubitata fede, e con parole di verità attesto, che per le maggiori diligenze fatte nelle notizie di mia Casa, non trovo che alcuna delle mie Donne Antenate si-asi maritata col Sig^r Conte Vincenzo della Torre Maceratese. Il che se fusse doverei pur sapere o per la Parentela che ne seguitasse, o per altra notizia. Anzi non solo col detto Sig^r Conte Vincenzo, ma ne pure con altro dei Signori Conti Torri di Macerata, v'è stato per mia cognizione alcun' Parentato. In fede di che ho sottoscritto questa lettera testimoniale. Fermo questo dì 16 Aprile, 1757.

Jo. CRISTIANO CAP^{to} CONSTANTINI.

IN nomine Dei, Amen. Fidem facio per presentes Ego Notarius Publicus Cùrialis, ac Collegialis Firmanus inscriptus; Qualiter coram me presens et personaliter constitutus, præscriptus illustrissimus Nobilis Vir Dominus Capitanus Cristianus Copstantini, filius bonæ memoriæ Joannis Augustini Majoris Militiarum duarum Provinciarum Marchiæ, Status Pontificii Patritius, Firmanus ex Nobili, et unica Patricia Familia Constantini, etatis suæ annorum quadraginta quinque, mihi &c. cognitus, meditatis &c. recognovit, et recognoscit ejus subscriptionem per ipsum confectam in calce superscriptæ ejus attestationis, esse exaratam ejus propria manu, literis, et caractere &c. omniaq; et singula in ea contenta, et expressa vera fuisse, et esse affirmavit &c. præterea tactis scripturis &c. juravit. Ideo in præmissorum fidem hic me scripsi subscripsi,

fi, et publicavi requisitus Firmi hac die decima sexta Aprilis
1757. Indictione quinta, Tempore Pontificatus Sanctissimi
in Christo Patris et Domini nostri, Domini Benedicti Di-
vina Providentiâ Papæ Decimi quarti, &c,



ANTONIUS HENRICUS MARTELLI,
Notarius supradictus rogatus.

ALEX.

ALEXANDER Borgia Dei et S. Apostolicæ sedis
Gratia, Archiepiscopus, et Princeps Firmanus Sanctissi-
Domini Nostri Papæ, Prelatus Domesticus et assistens Univer-
fis, &c. superscriptum Dominum Antonium Henricum Mar-
telli esse talem qualem se facit, suisque publicis et consimili-
bus scriptionibus tam Judicio, quam extra semper adhibitam
fuisse, et de presentibus quoque fidem adhiberi testamur.
Firmi ex Archiepiscopio 16 Aprilis, 1757.



L. CAROLUS GUERRIERI,
Pro Vicarius Generalis.

E. A. MAJORANUS,
P. Cancel. Generalis.

N U M B. VII.

Macerata, 31 Maggio, 1757.

A. C. e F^{ne} Stimo.

HO tralasciato fin qui darvi ragguaglio di quanto vi compiaceffo comandarmi con vostra Lettera delli 22 Marzo passato, perche hò voluto far ricercar esattamente, se vi sia stato dal anno 1650, in poi, da noi il Conte Vincenzo della Torre. Sono state tutte frustanee le perquisizioni fatte, e ne' libri publici della Città, come pure dell' Archivio. Se credete mai, che potesse aver origine della Casa, che abbiamo di presente, posso io attestarvi il contrario, mentre sono pochi anni, che dimora da Noi, ed è originaria dà Civita nova, et abitava in M^{te} santo.

Resta che voi mi diciate, se volete la giustificazione autentica del nostro Seg^{ro} della Città, ò d'altrui, che à vista ne farete servito. Scusate di grazia, se ho differito fin quì adempire a i vostri comandi, mentre ciò è derivato per esser stato molto tempo assente dalla Città, ed à chi n'aveo data la Com^e non prima di ieri quà in M^{te} dell' Olmo mi sia data questo riscontro, ed io sono sulla vigilia della partenza per Macerata, per dove se vaglio à servirvi comandatemi accertandovi che tengo viva la Memoria di Tutti di vostra casa, che vi prego salutarmi con tutti gl' amici. Addio

Vostro, &c.

CARLO COSTA,

N U M B. VIII.

In Dei nomine. Amen.

ADHIBITIS exactis, multisque repetitis diligentis in publicis Libris Ill^{mae} Communitatis hujus Civitatis Maceratae, in hac Secretaria Priorali existentibus, quondam D. Comitem Vincentium de Turre nullo unquam tempore nec in praestantissimo Reformatorum Elencho, nec in Nobilissimo Credentiariorum Catalogo, nec in nobili Magistratus cætu, & neque tandem in numero simplicium Civium hujus Civitatis prædictæ reperiri descriptum adnotatum, seu obsignatum, plenam indubitatamque fidem facio, verboque veritatis testor Ego Notarius publicus, & Secretarius infrascriptus. Et quia veritas sic se habet; ideo in præmissorum fidem hic me scripsi, subscripsi, ac solito meo quo utor Signo munivi, & publicavi, req^a, &c. hac die 19 Julii, 1757.



Ita est ANDREAS COTOLONI de Monte Sancto pub^l Apostolica Autoritate Not^{us} in Arch^o Rom^{ae} Curiae descript. Et ad presens Ill^{mae} Communitatis Maceratae Secretarius, in fidem, &c.

N U M B. IX.

EGO infra scriptus, in Provincia Romana Societatis Jesu Præpositus Provincialis, Fidem facio ac testor Archibaldum Bower Scotum, societati nostræ adscriptum fuisse in hac Romanâ Provincia die 9 Decembris anno 1706, in eaque, suo tempore, Sacerdotio initiatum, & ad solemnem quatuor votorum Professionem promotum per viginti circiter annos commoratum fuisse, donec anno 1726, insalutato hospite, ex Italia discessit. Eo tempore, quo apud nos moram fecit, Philosophicis ac Theologicis studiis vacavit, sane cum bono profectu: non ita tamen, ut non plures ex Condiscipulis ingenio ac doctrina sibi non pares modo, verum etiam superiores haberet. Adhibitus est etiam tum ante, tum post absoluta studia in ministeriis propriis nostræ Societatis sicut, ut cæteri: Sine ulla tamen prærogativa, que denotaret speciale in eo meritum aliquod agnosci, quo cæteris præmineret. Signanter nunquam addictus fuit Rhetoricæ docendæ in Collegio Romano, nisi forte aliquando ad breve tempus paucorum dierum, ut sæpe fit, supplendo vices magistrî: multoque minus destinatus fuit successor Patri Francisco Flaminio occasione professionis ejusdem in Saxoniam, quæ profectio est omnino commentitia, cum nè cogitatum de illa unquam fuerit, quod ego sciam. Quæ omnia, ex Catalogis, & Informationibus in Archivio nostræ hujus Romanæ Provinciæ asservatis, fideliter extracta, ut omnibus certò consent, præsens testimonium mea manu subscriptum meoque sigillo munitum dedi. Romæ in Collegio Romano die 8 Martii 1757.



HIERONIMUS RIDOLFI S. I.
Prepos^{us} Provin^{lis} Prov^æ Romanæ.

N U M B. X.

IN Cubiculo Patris Provincialis asservatur Liber manuscriptor in 4^{to} continet paginas 142, Titulus, Catalogus Sociorum Provinciæ Romanæ Societatis Jesu, Incipit, P. P. Professi quatuor Votorum, pag. 10. habetur, P. Archibaldus Bower Scotus natus 1686, 17 Januarii, Ingressus 1706, 9 Decembris, Professus 1723, 2 Februarii.

In Archivio Provinciæ Romanæ asservantur sequentes 20 Libri M. S. S. in 4^{to}. Videlicet, 1^{us} Catalogus brevis Provinciæ Romanæ anni 1707, ibi pag. 22. sub titulo, Domus Probationis Romanæ Novitii Scholastici. Octavianus, &c. *Archibaldus Bower* 9 Decembris 1706. 2^{us} Catalogus brevis Provinciæ Romanæ anni 1708, sub titulo eodem qui supra pag. 20. *Archibaldus Bower* 9 Decembris 1706. 3^{us} Catalogus ut supra anni 1709, sub titulo Domus Probationis Romanæ Scholastici Rhetoricæ Auditores Hieronymus, &c, p. 18. *Archibaldus Bower* 9 Decembris 1706. 4^{us} Catalogus ut supra anni 1710. sub titulo Collegium Romanum Scholastici Philosophiæ anno 2^{do} Contuccijs, &c. pag. 10. *Archibaldus Bower*. 5^{us} Catalogus ut supra anni 1711, sub titulo Collegium Romanum Scholastici Philosophiæ Anno 3^o Contuccijs, &c. pag. 10. *Archibaldus Bower*. 6^{us} Catalogus ut supra anni 1712, sub titulo Collegium Fanense, pag. 41. *Archibaldus Bower* Magister Humanitat. & primæ Classis Grammaticæ. Anno primo Magisterii Præf. Cong. discipulorum. 7^{us} Catalogus ut supra anni 1713, sub titulo Collegium Fanense, pag. 42. *Archibaldus Bower* Mag. Humanit. Anno 2^{do} Præf. Cong. Discipulorum. 8^{us} Catalogus ut supra anni 1714, sub titulo Collegium Firmanum, pag. 43. *Archibaldus Bower* Mag. Rhetor. Anno 3^o Magisterii Præf. Cong. suorum Discipulorum. 9^{us} Catalogus brevis ut supra anni 1715, sub titulo Collegium Firmanum, pag. 41. *Archibaldus Bower*, Mag. Rhetor. Anno 4^o Præf. Cong. suorum discipulorum. 10^{us} Catalogus brevis ut supra anni 1716, sub titulo Collegium Firmanum, pag. 38. *Archibaldus Bower* Mag. Rhetor. Anno 5^o Præf. Cong. suorum discipulorum. 11^{us} Catalogus brevis ut supra anni 1717, sub titulo Collegium Romanum Scholastici Theologiæ anno prim, P. Ignatius, &c. pag. 9. *Archibaldus Bower*. 12^{us} Catalogus brevis ubi supra anni 1718, sub titulo Collegium Romanum Scholastici

laſtici Theologiæ anno 2^{do}, P. Ignatius, &c. p. 9. *Archibaldus Bower*. 13^{us} Catalogus brevis ut ſupra anni 1719, ſub titulo Collegium Romanum Scholaſtici Theologiæ anno 3^o, P. Petrus, &c. p. 9. *Archibaldus Bower*. 14^{us} Catalogus brevis ut ſupra anni 1720, ſub titulo Collegium Romanum Scholaſtici Theologiæ anno 4^{to}, P. Ignatius, &c. p. 7. P. *Archibaldus Bower*. 15^{us} Catalogus brevis ut ſupra anni 1721, ſub titulo Collegium Aretinum, p. 38. P. *Archibaldus Bower* Lector Philoſophiæ, anno primo Conſultor. 16^{us} Catalogus brevis ut ſupra anni 1722, ſub titulo Collegium Aretinum, pag. 37. P. *Archibaldus Bower* Lector Philoſophiæ anno 2^{do} Conſult. 17^{us} Catalogus brevis ut ſupra anni 1723, ſub titulo Domus tertiæ Probationis Florentinæ Patres tertiæ Probationis, pag. 12. P. Franciſcus, &c. P. *Archibaldus Bower*; & in eodem Catalogo, ſub titulo Maceratenſe Collegium, p. 19. P. *Archibaldus Bower* Lector Metaphyſicæ, 18^{us} Catalogus brevis ut ſupra anni 1724, ſub titulo Collegium Maceratenſe, p. 50. *Pater Archibaldus Bower* Lector Phyſicæ anno 4^{to} in Phil. *Catechiſta noſtrorum Fratrum*, & puellarum Conſultor. 19^{us} Catalogus ut ſupra anni 1725, ſub titulo Collegium Maceratenſe, p. 21. P. *Archibaldus Bower* Lector Metaphyſicæ anno 5^{to} in Philoſ. *Catechiſta Puellarum & Conſultor* anno 2^{do}. 20^{us} Catalogus ut ſupra anni 1726, ſub titulo *Peruginum Collegium*, pag. 25. P. *Archibaldus Bower*, Lector Metaphyſicæ anno 6^o in Phil. Proponit meditationem noſtris Fratribus. 21^{us} Catalogus brevis ut ſupra, ſub titulo Proſecti in alias Provincias, &c. pag. 79. P. *Archibaldus Bower* 1726, in Anglicana.

Item in Cubiculo Patris Provincialis aſſervatur Liber MS. in folio, deſoris inſcriptus ut ſequitur, Liber de aptis ad legendum Romæ, & extra ab anno 1692. Ibi anno 1720, ſic habetur, Judicium Patris Joannis Baptiſtæ Conti, P. Bernardi de Vargas, P. Dominici Antorii Riccialdi, & P. Joſephi Carpani de aptitudine ad legendum eorum ſcholaſticorum, qui hoc anno 1720, Theologiam abſoluerunt. Pater Fabius Danzetta. Etiam Romæ juxta omnes, & etiam nunc, juxta Duos.

P. Laurentius Alticozzi } Etiam Romæ juxta omnes, &
P. Joſeph Struglio } etiam nunc juxta unum.

P. *Archibaldus Bower*. Ubi tres, etiam Romæ juxta tres. Ubi unus, deinde ubi tres, tum etiam, ſi opus ſit, Romæ juxta unum.

P. *Aſdrubal Contucci*, &c.

IN Nomine Domini. Amen. Fidem publicam facio, ver-
boque veritatis testor Ego Causarum Curiae Emⁱ & Rev^{mi}
Dom. Almae Urbis Cardinalis Vicarii Notarius publicus
infra-scriptus, qualiter sub hac infra-scripta Die requisitus.
Ego idem Notarius pro parte & ad instantiam Rmi Patris
Hieronymi Rodulphi Provincialis Provinciae Romanae ven.
Societatis Jesu degentis in ven. Collegio Romano de Urbe ad
effectum extraendi retro-scriptas partitas à Libris, sive Catalo-
gis supra enunciatis, & descriptis, penes ipsum Rmum Pat-
Provincialem existentes prout requisitioni predictae annuendo
circa horam vigesimam hujus infra-scripti Diei Personaliter
contuli ad supradictum Collegium Romanum, & precisè in
Cubiculo ejusdem Rmi Provincialis, ibique perventus Idem
Rmus Pater Provincialis mihi, &c. optimè cognitus, exhibuit
mihi Notario infra-scripto Libros ut supra enunciatos, ex qui-
bus extraxi, & exemplavi de verbo ad verbum retrodescriptas
partitas, deindeque facta cum eisdem originalibus diligenti,
& accurata collatione illas in omnibus, & per omnia concor-
dare inveni (salvo semper, &c.) Originalia verò eidem exhi-
benti restituta fuere, nulla penes me, &c. relictæ copiâ. In
quorum omnium, & singulorum Testimonium, &c. has pre-
sentes manu mea subscriptas, sigilloque quo utor, munitas
edidi. Romæ ex officio mei, &c. hac die 24 mensis Martii
anno millesimo septingentesimo quinquagesimo septimo, In-
dictione quinta Romanorum, Pontificatu autem in eodem
Christo Patris & Domini nostri Domini Benedicti, Divinâ
Providentiâ Papæ decimi quarti, anno ejus decimo septimo.



Ita est BERNARDINUS CICCONIUS
Caus. Cur Emi & Rmi D. Almae
Urbis Cardinalis Vicarii Notarius
in fide.

NOS

NOS ad presens Causarum Cur. Emi & Rmi D. ^{Almæ} Urbis Card^{lis} Vic. Notarii publici infra scripti.

UNIVERSIS, &c. Notum facimus, atque testamur, supradictum D. Barnardinum Cicconium esse Not. publicum Caus. Cur. Emi & Rmi D. Almæ Urbis Card^{lis} Vic. de præmissis rogatum, esse talem qualem se supra fecit, & facti, suisque fidibus & subscriptionibus, tam in iudicio, quam extra indubiam adhibitam fuisse, & de presenti quoque adhiberi fidem. In quorum, &c. datum Romæ hac die 24 Martii, 1757.



Ita est PLACIDUS GAUDENZ
Caus^m Curiz Emi & Rmi
Dom. Almæ Urbis Card^{lis}
Vicar. Notarius publicus in
fide.



Ita est BERNARDINUS DE MONTIBUS
(V^o) Caus. Curiz Emi & Rmi D.
Almæ Urbis Cardinalis Vicarii Not.